DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 102 372	CE 003 096
AUTHOR	Lewis, Morgan V.; And Others
TITLE	Prison Education and Rehabilitation: Illusion or Reality? A Case Study of an Experimental Program.
INSTITUTION	Pennsylvania State Univ., University Park. Inst. for Research on Human Resources.
SPONS AGENCY	National Endowment for the Humanities (NFAH), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Jun 73
NOTE	186p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.76 HC-$9.51 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	*Correctional Education; *Correctional Rehabilitation; Corrective Institutions; Educational Programs; *Educational Research; Failure Factors; *Humanities Instruction; *Secondary Education; Student Characteristics

ABSTRACT

A review of the literature, covering a variety of theories as to the causes of criminal behavior in young people and barriers to their rehabilitation, lays the groundwork for a report of an experimental program using the humanities to assist in the rehabilitation of young criminal offenders, at the State Correctional Institution at Camp Hill, Pa. The prison setting had a profound influence on the evolution of the program. Comparison with other inmates showed that the program was well received by most participants for whom significant changes were recorded on several of the psychological measures used. However followup surveys showed no differences in postprison behavior between participants and other inmates. This is also true of participants in other educational programs at the institution, raising the issues of punishment versus treatment and the role of education in a prison treatment program. The general conclusion is reached that the requirement that a prison confine inmates produces an inherently punishing environment that is antithetical to rehabilitative efforts. While it is unlikely that the humanities, or any other educational program will influence postprison behavior, such programs can serve to enrich the lives of inmates while they are in prison. (Author/SA)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ED102372

THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE FOR RESEARCH ON HUMAN RESOURCES

The Institute for Research on Human Resources of The Pennsylvania State University was established in December 1964 as a multi-disciplinary intercollege organization to conduct research on, and provide graduate training in, the utilization and development of human resources. The Institute conducts experimental programs and evaluates public policies and institutions concerned with education, corrections, manpower, medical care, welfare, science policy, and religion.

In conducting experimental programs in such areas as school dropouts and corrections, the Institute has directed its attention to institutional changes which are more effective in the achievement of the goals of society. Its evaluative research has included cost-effectiveness studies in areas such as vocational education, child health and welfare, manpower, and elementary education.

An important aspect of the Institute's overall program is graduate training. Graduate students participate in all phases of the Institute's research projects, in the areas of their major interests.

Dissemination of the research findings of the Institute is achieved through publications, workshops, and seminars, by testimony presented to such public agencies as the U.S. Congress, state legislatures, and the executive branch at all governmental levels, and by advice to various public and private agencies.

A center within the Institute contributes to its research efforts. The Center for the Study of Science Policy, created in mid-1969, is primarily involved in studying the relationship of state and local science policy to national science policy, and with the application of scientific and technological knowledge to domestic problems of state and local bodies. The Center has completed a series of analytical studies, collected quantitative and qualitative information on the organization of research and development within the public sector, and sponsored workshops and seminars for those involved in the formulation and implementation of science policy.

ED102372

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PRISON EDUCATION AND REHABILITATION: ILLUSION OR REALITY?

A Case Study of an Experimental Program

Morgan V. Lewis

with the assistance of
David C. Gumpper
Joan L. Meyer
Andrew Broughton
Alice Beamesderfer

Institute for Research on Human Resources
The Pennsylvania State University
University Park, Pennsylvania 16802

June 1973

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities. The analysis and recommendations contained in this report are those of the senior author and do not necessarily reflect the position of any other individual or agency.

PREFACE

The project described in this report required the cooperation of many different agencies and people. While it is not possible to list all of those who participated in the project, its staff does wish to acknowledge those who made the most significant contributions. The National Endowment for the Humanities provided the funds which made the whole effort possible. Dr. Jacob J. Kaufman, Director of the Institute for Research on Human Resources, initially suggested a study of this type and advised and assisted in all phases of its conduct and evaluation. Dr. Chadwick Hansen helped to plan the content of the program and served as consultant.

For providing a setting where the program could be conducted, we are grateful to the Pennsylvania Bureau of Correction and its former Commissioner Arthur Prasse, and to the State Correctional Institution at Camp Hill, its Superintendent Ernest Patton, staff members Martin Brandt and Alfred Isenberg, and the 173 residents of the Institution who took part either as students or control subjects.

The teachers had perhaps the most difficult task of all in translating the objectives of the program into actual classroom activities. To them we extend a special thanks: David Miller, Coordinator; Craig Kreider; Clyde Rohland; James Sprowls; and Ronald Zeigler.

In the follow-up of the inmates after they left Camp Hill, the Pennsylvania Board of Probation and Parole was especially helpful. We are grateful to Mr. Elton R. Smith and his successor, Mr. John J. Burke, for arranging for their agents to serve as interviewers. The questionnaire that was administered during the follow-up interviews included scales developed by several social scientists. The names of these individuals and the sources for the scales are cited in the text. We appreciate their kindness in allowing us to use their scales.

In the preparation of this report, David C. Gumpper was primarily responsible for Chapter 6, Joan L. Meyer for Chapter 3, and Andrew Broughton for Chapter 2. Alice Beamesderfer contributed substantially to the organization of the material and to its final editing. Others who assisted in various ways were Deborah Check, Steven Dooley, and Norman Kalber.

Naturally, those who contributed to the project cannot be held responsible for its final results or the way in which their contributions are reflected in this report. That responsibility must rest with the project director.

MORGAN V. LEWIS
May 31, 1973

CONTENTS

Preface iii

List of Tables viii

1 INTRODUCTION 1

The Program 3

Evaluation 4

Summary 6

PART I A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

2 CAUSES OF CRIMINAL BEHAVIOR IN YOUNG PEOPLE 11

Classical Theories 12

Psychological Theories 13

Sociological Theories 17
- Ecology, Role, and Class 17
- The Effects of the Family 20
- The Gang 21
- Schools and Mass Media 26

Anthropological Theories 26

Summary 28

3 BARRIERS TO REHABILITATION 29

The Encapsulated Man—Physical and Psychic Boundaries 30

Social Presses on Inmate Life Space 34
- The Subjugated Group: Deviant Milieu 34
  - Isolation and Neutralization of "Outside" Relationships 34
  - The Pervasive Peer Group or the "Atomized" Society? 36
  - Exploitation of the Defenseless by the Powerful 38
  - Racism in Prisons 41

Precarious Authority and Pernicious Bureaucracy 43
The Authoritarian/Bureaucratic Balance 43
Maintaining the Distance between Keepers and Kept 44
Conflicting Views of Criminals and Treatment 46
Intersection and Collision between Inmates and Staff 48
Inmate Culture as a Mirror of the Administrative Power Structure 49
Total Dependency: A Terrifying Return to Childhood 51
Hatred of the Keepers 52
Corruption of Authority: The Subverting Coalition 54
Summary 56

PART II A CASE STUDY

4 AN EXPERIMENTAL HUMANITIES PROGRAM: THE SETTING AND THE INMATES 59
The Setting 60
The Inmates 63
Selecting the Subjects 63
Characteristics of the Subjects 64
Summary 67

5 THE PROGRAM AND ITS PROBLEMS 68
The Program 68
Problems Encountered 71
Summary 75

6 EVALUATION OF THE EXPERIMENTAL PHASE 77
Acceptance of the Program 77
Changes in the Students 79
Pretest Analysis 80
Pre to Posttest Analysis 84
Posttest Analysis 87
Summary 89

7 RECIDIVISM, EMPLOYMENT, AND MAJOR PROBLEMS AFTER LEAVING PRISON 91
Definition and Prediction of Recidivism 93
  Defining Recidivism 93
  Recidivism Rates 93
  Predicting Recidivism 95
Employment Experiences 97
  A Case History 98
  Indices of Employment 99
    Jobs Held 100
    Amount of Time Employed 100
    Quality of Jobs 100
    Job Satisfaction 101
    Reasons for Leaving 102
  Employment and Recidivism 102
Main Problems following Release 104
  Training at Camp Hill 105
Summary 107
8 ATTITUDES AND VALUES AFTER LEAVING PRISON 108
Humanities-Related Activities 109
Values and Goals 110
Self-Concepts 113
Racial Attitudes 114
Psychological Well Being 115
Summary 118
9 THE HUMANITIES IN PRISON: SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS 119
Punishment or Treatment? 121
Effects of Prison Education 124
The Role of the Humanities in Prison Education 127
APPENDIX A ACCEPTANCE OF THE PROGRAM 133
APPENDIX B TESTS AND SCALES USED TO ASSESS PRE- TO POST-PROGRAM EFFECTS 145

APPENDIX C PRETEST ANALYSIS 147
APPENDIX D PRE TO POSTTEST ANALYSIS 149
APPENDIX E RECIDIVISM, EMPLOYMENT, AND MAIN PROBLEMS 150
APPENDIX F ATTITUDES AND VALUES 160
REFERENCES 173

TABLES

1 Classification of Subjects at Each Follow-up Interview by Program 92

2 Recidivism Reported by Parole Agents, by Group by Year 94

3 Labor Force Participation and Unemployment Rates among Respondents at Time of Follow-up Interviews 97

4 Mean Indices of Employment Experiences, Recidivists and Nonrecidivists by Year of New Offense 103

APPENDIX TABLES

A-1 Ratings of the Humanities Program 133

A-2 Humanities Students' Opinions about Their Various Educational Experiences 134

A-3 Experimental and Control Group Opinions about the Prison Educational Program 140

C-1 Pre-experimental Differences among Experimental and Control Groups 147

D-1 Mean Pretest and Posttest Scores by Groups 149

E-1 Mean Pretest Scores of Recidivists and Nonrecidivists by Year of New Offense 150

E-2 Mean Posttest Scores of Recidivists and Nonrecidivists by Year of New Offense 151

E-3 Classification of First Company Worked for after Camp Hill, 1970 Follow-up 152

E-4 First Jobs Held after Leaving Camp Hill, 1970 Follow-up 152

E-5 Equivalent Months and Percent of Available Time Employed, Total Sample, 1970 and Matched Sample, 1970–72 153

E-6 Wages Received, First Job and Most Recent Job, Total Sample, 1970 and Matched Sample, 1970–72 154

E-7 Socioeconomic Index of First and Most Recent Jobs, Total Sample, 1970 and Matched Sample, 1970–72 155

E-8 Job Satisfaction Rating: First Job after Prison, Most Recent Job, and Total Follow-up Period 156
E-9 Intercorrelation of Ratings and JDI Measures of Job Satisfaction, 1970, 1971, 1972 157
E-10 Reason for Leaving First Job Held after Camp Hill, 1970 Follow-up 158
E-11 Main Postrelease Problems, 1970 Follow-up 158
E-12 Postrelease Usefulness of Training or Education Received at Camp Hill, 1970 Follow-up 159
E-13 Suggestions for Improving Educational Programs at Camp Hill, 1970 Follow-up 159
F-1 Questionnaire Scales: Means and Standard Deviations by Group for Each Follow-up 160
F-2 Item Means for Humanities-Related Activities Scale by Group, 1970 Follow-up 164
F-3 Means and Standard Deviations of Items in Humanities-Related Activities Scale by Group for Each Follow-up 165
F-4 Means of Total Scores for Humanities-Related Activities Scale, Each Follow-up Group 167
F-5 Means of Life Value Scales by Group, 1970 Follow-up 167
F-6 Means of Social Responsibility Scale by Group, Each Follow-up 168
F-7 Means of Attitudes toward Self Scales by Groups, 1970 Follow-up 168
F-8 Attitudes toward Racial Equality, Total Groups and Groups by Race, 1970 Follow-up 169
F-9 Means of Measures of Well Being by Group, 1970 Follow-up 169
F-10 Intercorrelations of Scales from Follow-up Questionnaire, 1970 170
F-11 Intercorrelations of Scales from Follow-up Questionnaire, 1971 171
F-12 Intercorrelations of Scales from Follow-up Questionnaire, 1972 171
F-13 Intercorrelations of Total Scale Scores with Themselves across Follow-ups, Matched Sample 171

1

INTRODUCTION

Within the past few years the problems confronting the nation's correctional system have become issues of significant domestic concern. The uprising and killings at the Attica State Correctional Facility, the trial of the "Soledad Brothers," and the death in San Quentin of George Jackson are some of the prominent events that have focused national attention on prisons and the problems they are facing.

There appears to be a widespread national concern that prisons should be correctional institutions; that is, they should rehabilitate the criminal offenders assigned to them. It is generally agreed by a majority of the public and by most of those professionally involved in corrections that an inmate should leave prison a better person than when he entered. He should have increased his educational and vocational skills, learned to control his criminal impulses, and developed sound values and habits as a citizen and worker. This, of course, is the ideal, but it is the ideal toward which much of modern correctional practice is aimed.

The project described in this report was very much a reflection of this philosophy. It had the lofty goal of using the humanities to assist in the rehabilitation of young criminal offenders. The program was based on the assumption that the kind of young men who typically end up in prison have rarely had any exposure to the humanities. Yet it seemed obvious that young men in their late adolescence who found themselves in prison had to be concerned with the meaning of their lives. The humanities appeared to be an excellent vehicle to tap this concern.

The aim of the program that was conducted at the State Correctional Institution at Camp Hill, Pennsylvania, was to introduce materials and activities that would lead its students to examine their lives and would help them to find a sense of personal identity and a set of values consistent with life in society. The program fell far short of these ambitious goals. The basic findings of the project can be summarized in four statements:

1. The humanities program was well received by a majority of its students.

2. The prison environment had a powerful influence upon the content of the program and methods used in it.

3. There were some indications that the program had some effect upon its students while they were still in prison.

4. There was no evidence that the program had any effects that persisted after the inmates were released from prison.

The failure to find more significant or persistent effects from this program led to a reconsideration of the traditional rehabilitation approach. It should be noted that the humanities program was a supplementary one, added onto the most extensive educational program of any state prison in Pennsylvania. By contemporary standards of correctional practice, Camp Hill is a model prison—but it is still a prison, which means that it must confine inmates. This is the fundamental function of a prison, and by its very nature it generates a social situation that is punishing to most inmates and is characterized by continuous, but usually latent, conflict between inmates and staff. Can rehabilitation take place under these conditions?

The answer advanced in this report is that true rehabilitation, in the sense of positive personal growth, cannot take place in an inherently punishing environment. The data from the present study, as well as other evaluations of prison education that are reviewed, suggest that these programs have little, if any, postprison effect. If education, which is usually the most extensive treatment program in a prison, has little effect, what can be expected from other programs?

To conclude that true rehabilitation is usually impossible in a prison is not to recommend that educational programs be abolished. On the contrary, it is recommended that education can play a role within a correctional institution and that the humanities can contribute to this role. Its objective, however, is not to rehabilitate but to broaden and enrich, at least for a few hours, the lives of the inmates while they are in prison.

In this chapter, the project which led to these conclusions is summarized and the contents of the other chapters are previewed. The report is divided into two parts: Part I attempts to provide a perspective on criminal behavior and on the prison as a social institution; Part II consists of a description of the humanities program, its setting, the problems it encountered, an evaluation of its results, and some conclusions.

Chapter 2 summarizes the major theories that have attempted to explain the causes of criminal behavior, particularly juvenile delinquency. This review reveals the diverse nature of research in the field and suggests why a consistent theory of rehabilitative practice has not emerged. Because of the pervasive influence of the prison environment upon the evolution of the humanties program, Chapter 3 discusses the basic structure of a prison and the many interactions which take place in it. The thesis developed in this chapter is that because of the very nature of the prisons, many antirehabilitative conditions are inherent in it. It should not be inferred that this is an indirect criticism of prison staff; the basic problem of a prison lies not in the inadequacies of its personnel, but in the nature of its organization and the resulting social roles which its members must play. It should be particularly noted that with regard to the institution where the humanities study was conducted, the State Correctional Institution at Camp Hill, the project staff found the Institution's staff to be decent, sincere people who were honestly trying to provide helpful services to the inmates in their charge. Their failure to produce more positive changes in their charges, as well as the failure of the teachers in the humanities program, is attributable more to the prison environment than to personnel inadequacies.

THE PROGRAM

The humanities program was conducted from September 1968 until May 1969. Soon after it began, the staff became aware that many of the basic assumptions that had guided the development of the program were not appropriate. One of these basic assumptions was that the class should be as student-oriented as possible. The humanities were broadly defined to the students as being about "what it means to be a human being." Within this broad framework, the students were encouraged to identify areas of interest which they would like to explore further. Those students who did not express an area of interest were allowed to do anything they wanted as long as they did not disturb the other students.

Another basic assumption was that the main instructional technique would be class discussion. Once areas of interest were identified and appropriate material provided, it was assumed that the students would discuss the meaning and implications of this material. The concept of the humanities as a rehabilitation technique was based on the premise that group discussion of significant issues had the potential to lead to a reevaluation of the dominant values and attitudes in one's life. If the discussion had this result, the student might be made aware of alternatives for his life—alternatives that were not available within his previous perspective.

These assumptions did not provide a workable model for the actual conduct of the course. Some students responded to the freedom of the classes by choosing to do nothing, but far more expressed interest in topics which the prison officials were reluctant to have directly examined. The black inmates wanted material on their race—black history, black culture, and the writing of black separatists. Many of the white inmates wanted material on the Ku Klux Klan and Nazi Germany, including the "final solution" to the Jewish problem. At the time of the program, the racial climate in the Institution was especially tense, and its staff was very concerned about introducing anything that might worsen the situation. As a result, the program had to avoid direct response to these interests.

More detrimental to the original plan of the program, however, was the general unwillingness of the students to enter into group discussion. There were many reasons for this reluctance, but the dominant one was probably the continuous latent conflict, inherent in virtually all prisons, between inmates and staff. In a prison, inmates comply rather than cooperate, and communication requires cooperation. As long as the humanities teachers were identified with the staff, very little communication took place.

Chapter 4 describes the prison in which the program was conducted and the characteristics of the inmates who took part in it. The manner in which the security considerations of the Institution, the racial tensions, and the staff-inmate conflict influenced the evolution of the humanities program are discussed in Chapter 5.

EVALUATION

Chapter 6 presents an evaluation of the effects of the program on the inmates while they were still in prison. This evaluation was based on a battery of psychological measures that was administered to the humanities students and two other groups of inmates at the beginning and end of the humanities program. These other inmates were selected from the regular academic program and the vocational training program to match the humanities students as closely as possible. It is important to note that all three groups included in this study took part in some educational program while they were in prison. The comparisons that are made for evaluative purposes are among inmates who received different types of education and not between some inmates who took part in an educational program and others who did not. For evaluative purposes it would have been useful to include a group that received no education, but such a group was not available at Camp Hill. Because Camp Hill serves young offenders, it makes a major effort in education, and virtually all of its inmates receive some type of instruction.

Comparisons of the scores on the psychological measures used to evaluate the humanities program showed that the humanities students had changed significantly on some scales while the other inmates had not. These changes suggest that the humanities program had made its students somewhat more aware of the realities of their lives. Coupled with this increased awareness, however, was an increased need to protect oneself from these realities. Thus, the program only partially achieved its objectives. It made the students more aware, but this increased awareness did not include other alternatives for their lives, so they tended to shield themselves from it. Given the realities which most young inmates must confront, this is an understandable, if unfortunate, reaction. Nevertheless, the program was well received by a majority of its students, and many of them elected to continue in it even after the compulsory phase was ended.

To determine the postprison effects of the humanities program, its students plus the inmates in the two comparison groups were followed up for almost three years after they left Camp Hill. Each year, they were interviewed about their work and vocational experiences and were asked to complete a confidential questionnaire containing scales to measure values, attitudes, and self-concepts. The results obtained in these yearly interviews make up the contents of Chapters 7 and 8.

Chapter 7 contains information on actual behavior following release from Camp Hill—new criminal offenses, work experiences, and major problems encountered. In none of these areas were significant differences found among the three groups. There was, in other words, no evidence that the postprison behavior of the humanities students differed in any appreciable way from the behavior of the other former inmates.

New criminal convictions averaged between 13 percent and 25 percent across groups in each follow-up, and each year about 30 percent were back in prison. Whether this 30 percent figure is considered hopeful or discouraging depends on one's perspective. Because of the variability in the definition of recidivism, comparable figures for other young offenders could not be located. It is generally agreed, however, that recidivism is most prevalent among young offenders and among offenders convicted of property crimes rather than crimes of violence. Since the Camp Hill inmates were all young, and most were sentenced for property crimes, even higher recidivism rates might have been expected. However, if it is expected that a prison with a strong rehabilitation emphasis can virtually eliminate recidivism, these results will be discouraging.

The results concerning employment experiences will also be discouraging to those who contend that providing jobs for ex-offenders is the key to reducing recidivism. Unemployment rates were high, about 30 percent, among all three groups at each follow-up. Their employment problem did not appear to be one of locating jobs, but rather of retaining them. Almost all of the respondents reported frequent job changes, often, they claimed, at their own initiative. The experiences of the recidivists did not differ significantly from those of the nonrecidivists.

If it were possible to guarantee each released inmate a secure job with decent working conditions and a reasonable income, the probability of new criminal behavior would undoubtedly be reduced. As a nation, however, we find it difficult to make this kind of job available to many law-abiding citizens, especially to the young, who have limited work experiences and whose aspirations often make them reluctant to accept less desirable types of work. The unemployment rates among young people and the discontent among many blue collar workers bear ample testimony to the need for providing more jobs and better working conditions.

These, however, are general problems of society, and a correctional institution cannot be expected to change them. All it can do is provide education and training to equip its inmates to deal more successfully with society as it exists. The evidence in Chapter 7 shows that the type of educational programs attended while in prison had no relation to recidivism or employment experience. The evidence in Chapter 8 shows that educational programs are also unrelated to postprison attitudes. The questionnaire which the respondents completed during the yearly follow-up interviews included fifteen psychological scales. Not one of these yielded any significant differences when compared across the three educational programs. This means, of course, that the humanities program, which laid special emphasis on examining one's values and attitudes, had no more effect following release from prison than the regular prison programs to which it was compared. There was not even any evidence that the humanities program caused its students to be more likely to engage in the activities to which they were exposed in the program.

In general, the results of this study lead to the conclusion that the type of educational programs to which inmates are exposed while in prison has no influence upon their postrelease attitudes or behavior. Because this conclusion is contrary to accepted theory in corrections, the issue of punishment versus treatment and the role of education in a prison treatment program are examined in Chapter 9.

SUMMARY

This chapter provides a broad overview of an experimental educational program that was conducted to test whether the humanities could contribute to the rehabilitation of young criminal offenders. The program was conducted for one academic year, and its immediate and long-range effects were evaluated. There was some evidence of program effects while the inmates were still in prison but no evidence of any effects over the thirty-three-month follow-up period. It appears that the requirement that a prison confine inmates produces an inherently punishing environment that is antithetical to rehabilitative efforts. While it is unlikely that the humanities, or any other educational program, will influence postprison behavior, such programs can serve to enrich the lives of inmates while they are in prison.

PART I A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

2

CAUSES OF CRIMINAL BEHAVIOR IN YOUNG PEOPLE

In reviewing the literature on juvenile delinquency, perhaps the most difficult task is that of assigning a meaning to the word "delinquency." A detailed inspection of the research in this area reveals that different investigators approach the problem in various ways which, in turn, lead to different theoretical notions.

The particular points of view of the diverse disciplines have yielded theories of causation which are not easily interrelated. For example, the psychologist, with his emphasis on the individual and the "psyche," usually sees delinquency as being somehow related to emotional problems; the sociologist, who deals with groups and organizations, tends to see delinquency as related to the family and the gang; the anthropologist, whose background is in the study of cultures, may attempt to explain delinquency in terms of culture, subculture, and ethnicity. The aim of this chapter is not to derive a definitive analysis of the etiology of delinquency, but rather to provide the reader with an overview of this complex field and an awareness of the various reasons which have been suggested as causes of delinquency.

The first problem, then, is to derive some definition of the topic under consideration. For the purposes of this review, an attempt will be made to use the broadest definition possible, on the grounds that it will allow the greatest leeway in considering theoretical formulations. Thus, the particular definition to be used here is primarily a legal one; it relies heavily on the observation that the only constant which holds for all the behavior under discussion is its illegality within some social system at some point in time. This type of definition finds considerable support in the recent literature. Martin and Fitzpatrick (1964) state that delinquency is that behavior of minors which society has defined as illegal. They add that while this behavior may be related to or coexist with such conditions as neglect, dependency, and mental illness, it is not the same as or equal to these conditions. Other authors emphasize the importance of the environmental setting in defining delinquency. Horrocks and Gottfried (1966), for example, believe that the environmental setting may have a great deal to do with whether certain behavior is considered delinquent. In short, the concept of delinquency is closely related to the environment within which the behavior occurs, and its definition takes into account both the law and the conditions that are somehow related to causality.

A more outspoken variation of this same definitional theme was advanced by Turk (1964), who views delinquency as the "illegitimation of pre-adults" due to intergenerational conflict. Turk points out that it is the interaction of adolescent behavior and the law (i.e., expectations of the adult world) that lead to the label "delinquent," not just the actions of "deviant" adolescents.

Another avenue toward definition that is open to the social scientist is factor analysis of the behaviors involved. Quay and Blumen (1963) used this approach by culling the court records of 191 white male delinquents for the presence or absence of thirteen delinquent acts. They then correlated and factor analyzed this information. After factor rotation, the four factors that emerged were interpreted as (1) truancy, (2) impulsivity and thrill seeking, (3) interpersonal aggression, and (4) impersonal aggression. A fifth factor in their analysis appeared to be related to the age of the adolescents when the acts were committed. It is interesting to note that these factors are closely associated with some of the theories of causation.

Although many of the theories of delinquency encompass different definitions, it is axiomatic that any definition one uses should hold the greatest probability of leading to a complete understanding of the problem. A theory that begins with a very narrow definition cannot help but ignore important data.

CLASSICAL THEORIES

The earliest worker in the classical school of criminology was probably Cesare Beccaria, whose book *Crime and Punishment* was published in 1764. His ideas were based on the doctrine of moral responsibility, and he wrote the book in an attempt to associate kinds of punishment with types of crime so that punishment would be an effective deterrent to crime.

The next step in the development of criminology was the neoclassical school, represented in the 1800s by such people as Lombroso in Italy and Goring in England (Robison, 1960). Lombroso switched emphasis from the act to the criminal individual and introduced the idea that a criminal is the product of hereditary asocial forces. This hypothesis led to the study of physiological characteristics in the search for a criminal type. Goring refuted this work, however, with a study of the physical characteristics of 3,000 English prisoners and suggested that something like intelligence was the characteristic which should be studied.

According to Robison (1960), the glands were thought to hold the solution to the problem of delinquency in the 1920s. Schlapp and Smith

(1928) thought that the whole explanation would be found in excess glandular secretions, which they considered to be the cause of emotional instability.

Probably the greatest legacy left by the neoclassical school is the theory that delinquency is related to body structure. Kretschmer's work in relating body structure to mental illness (1925) may have encouraged workers in criminology. More recently, Sheldon, Hartl, and McDermott (1949) concluded that the mesomorph was particularly susceptible to delinquency, whereas the ectomorph and the endomorph were not.

The Gluecks (1956), who have followed a related line of reasoning in much of their work, went so far as to list certain factors that they believed differentiated delinquents from nondelinquents. Their hypothesis was that the body build of an adolescent is determined by his infant physique. This has been questioned by students of child development, who point out the potent effects of such factors as diet, environment, and activities over a ten- or fifteen-year period.

While this work on the physiological correlates of delinquency continued, other investigators were furthering the clinical approach to delinquency first proposed by Goring. Sutherland in the 1920s and Slawson at about the same time compared the incidence of feeblemindedness in delinquent and normal populations (Robison, 1960). They found, after the misunderstandings surrounding intelligence tests had been cleared up, that there was no direct relationship between IQ scores and delinquency. Robison (1960) brings this area of study up to date with the conclusion that IQ is related to officially reported delinquency only because it is also related to educational opportunities, which are poorest in urban, lower income areas.

The most recent research linking physiology and crime has concerned chromosomal anomalies. While this work has been most prevalent in Great Britain, Telfer (1968) studied 129 convicted criminals in Pennsylvania and found a high rate of gross chromosomal errors among them. These conditions were noted in tall males and consisted of either the Klinefelter syndrome or the forty-seven, XYY chromosome pattern. The latter pattern is thought to be particularly related to crimes of violence.

PSYCHOLOGICAL THEORIES

Psychological theories of causation tended to appear later and were more sophisticated in their attempts to explain delinquency. In historical perspective they follow Lombroso and Goring in their basically clinical approaches to the problem. Such psychological theories emphasize the characteristics of delinquent individuals in terms of mental illness and personality adjustment (Martin and Fitzpatrick, 1964).

Until very recently, the psychoanalytic theory of Sigmund Freud was the most influential in this area. The most basic concept that he contributed to the study of behavior was that of unconscious motivation. Martin and Fitzpatrick (1964) write that when psychoanalytic theories are applied to the problem of causation in delinquency, two basic kinds of theories can emerge: "instinct" theories or psychodynamic "problem-solving" theories.

Instinct theories are those based on the notion that the contents of the id are common to everyone at birth. These include all kinds of impulsive, acting-out urges, and thus criminality is not learned but innate. What is learned is the control of the impulses of the id. Delinquents have failed to learn these controls (that is, to develop a superego) and are therefore more prone to conflict with society.

Psychodynamic problem-solving theories are somewhat more complex. Briefly stated, they hold that delinquent behavior is ". . . unconsciously contrived by the personality as a means of dealing with some problem of psychic adjustment arising out of conflicts among the id, ego, and superego" (Martin and Fitzpatrick, 1964, p. 136). The well-known work of Healy and Bronner (1936) exemplifies this type of research. They compared 105 delinquent children with their nondelinquent siblings and concluded that a vast majority of the delinquent group was emotionally disturbed, whereas only a small minority of the comparison group could be so described. Healy and Bronner believed that the delinquent acts committed were related to the delinquents' problems and thus had meaning for them.

Like all theories of causation, psychoanalytic theories are open to criticism. Martin and Fitzpatrick (1964) point out some of the obvious shortcomings—e.g., not all delinquent behavior is due to emotional disturbance—and emphasize the failure of such theories to account for the relationship between the form of an act and the particular delinquent who performed it.

Another approach that has been used by psychologically oriented researchers is that of attempting to construct typologies of delinquent behavior in order to arrive at better understanding. First among these was Levy, who distinguished among three main categories of delinquents: (1) those whose delinquency results from the environmental situation; (2) those whose delinquency is primarily due to faulty family relationships; and (3) those whose delinquency stems from some kind of internal "sick" condition. Levy held that each of these types must receive appropriate and differential treatment (Robison, 1960).

Jenkins (1956) has proposed another kind of typology which closely parallels the aforementioned psychoanalytic theories of causation. This is a twofold scheme of reaction patterns consisting of the adaptive and the maladaptive patterns. One does not have to know that Jenkins is a psychiatrist to see the relationship between the adaptive pattern and the problem-solving psychodynamic theories and the corresponding relationship between the maladaptive pattern and the instinct theories. It may be argued, however, that Jenkins has added the influence of the environment to his typology; therefore, some progress has been made. One cannot have an adaptive pattern, in the sense that he proposed it, without having an environment to which one can adapt. In Jenkins' system these two types of delinquents need different kinds of treatment. Some have applied his system to institutionalized delinquents, but little has been done with his suggestions for treatment.

A similar classification system has been used recently by Brigham, Ricketts, and Johnson (1967), who compared the reported maternal and paternal behaviors of "solitary" as opposed to "social" delinquents. There is a great similarity between Jenkins' adaptive delinquent and the present "social" delinquent, just as there is similarity between the maladaptive delinquent and the presently discussed "solitary" delinquent. Brighams' finding is noteworthy in that both groups (social and solitary) had difficulties with male authority figures, but only the solitary delinquents had difficulties with female authority figures. It can be seen that this kind of study quickly leads to a consideration of family dynamics (which will be discussed in a later section).

While it may seem questionable to include the research of a lawyer and a social worker in this review of psychological theories of causation, the work of Eleanor and Sheldon Glueck must be included here. Theirs is one of the most ambitious programs ever undertaken in an attempt to get at the causal factors of juvenile delinquency. This review will concentrate on the latest of their many books, namely, their 1968 publication *Delinquents and Nondelinquents in Perspective*.

The methodology used by the Gluecks has been the same since the early 1940s. It consists of comparison studies and, later, follow-up studies of 500 matched pairs of males. In the beginning, one boy of each pair was an incarcerated delinquent and the other a nondelinquent from the Boston school system. The Gluecks' early work led them to list physical, temperamental, attitudinal, intellectual, and sociocultural characteristics that they believed differentiated the groups with some reliability. Also derived from this work were some scales for the prediction of delinquency based on the boys' family relationships.

In their latest work, which includes follow-up data on these pairs through age thirty-one, the Gluecks attempt to draw some theoretical conclusions with regard to causation. They state their essential point early in their chapter on theory:

> The descriptive analysis has indicated beyond reasonable doubt that in all life's activities considered in this inquiry, the men who as boys comprised our sample of juvenile delinquents have continued on a path markedly divergent from those who as juveniles had been included in the control group of nondelinquents (Glueck and Glueck, 1968, p. 169).

From this observation they draw the inference that the

> . . . mass impact of the external societal environment, or the general culture, is less significant in generating delinquency and extending it into criminal recidivism than are the biologic endowments of the individual and the parental influences of the formative years of early childhood (p. 170).

From this inference they go on to claim that, unlike theories that focus on such aspects as poverty, slums, and differential association, their theory can discriminate individuals who are or who become delinquent. The Gluecks do not deny that other conditions contribute to the problem of delinquency; rather they deny that these conditions are the influences ". . . most frequently, potently, and selectively involved in generating delinquency in childhood" (p. 171). The conditions that are involved, they contend, are hereditary individual characteristics and early family characteristics.

Obviously, when a theory and its proponents have been around as long as this one, the theory becomes a prime target for criticism. Perhaps the most cogent criticism of the Gluecks' work arises from the fact that delinquency is hopelessly confounded with the effects of institutionalization in their comparison study. Are the observations of differences (which continue up to twenty years) a function of the boys' delinquent behavior or of the fact that time spent in a correctional institution is a unique experience that can affect all aspects of life once a prisoner has been released? To answer this criticism, at least one other group, made up of nonadjudicated but admitted offenders, would have been necessary at the inception of the study.

Another criticism stems from the Gluecks' observation that the institutionalized population is not representative of delinquents in general. The lack of Negroes in the population is enough to document this point. It is interesting that the Gluecks' prediction scales do very poorly when used in a population of Puerto Rican and Negro youths (Craig, 1958).

Recently, the clinical approach to delinquency has begun to be influenced by the traditional focus of general psychology—learning theories.

This can be seen in both the influence of social learning theory (to be discussed later with differential association theory) and more traditional learning theories, such as that of discrimination learning. Most of the research in the latter category stems from Cleckly's (1955) work, which tried to better define the diagnostic classification of psychopaths. He distinguished between "primary" and "secondary" psychopaths, the former being the classic guiltless, nondirected criminal and the latter being a neurotic person led into criminality by his neurosis. With this distinction, researchers began to investigate the ways in which delinquents learn. An early study along this line by Lykken (1957) found that primary psychopaths were relatively incapable of learning to avoid punished responses in a laboratory learning task. More recently, Schlicter (1969) used a discrimination task to find that delinquent males did not learn a task in response to punishment but did learn it for reward. This pattern is the exact opposite of that exhibited by nondelinquent males, but is similar to the pattern exhibited by nondelinquent females. Further documentation of this finding would raise some intriguing questions for the field of corrections.

Another variable that interests researchers working with learning theory and delinquency is delay of reward. Bixenstine and Buterbaugh (1967) compared integrative behavior (e.g., maximizing reward over time) in eighty-eight adolescent boys with comparable IQs. They found that delinquency was related to the choice of a small but immediate reward (one candy bar) over a larger but remote reward (three candy bars). They also found that Negro delinquents tended to choose the delayed reward more often than white delinquents. The obvious problem with current research in the area of delay of reward is the confounding of delay with amount; the delayed reward is always larger.

In summary, the main focus of psychological theories of causation is the individual. The most common methodology has been to compare delinquents to nondelinquents in various ways. While some interesting information has emerged from these attempts, no definitive answers have been found.

SOCIOLOGICAL THEORIES

Ecology, Role, and Class

This group of studies and related theories is probably best known under the label of the "Chicago studies," for it was at the University of Chicago that the methodology originated. Briefly, this methodology divides the city into a series of concentric circles and then studies particular social phenomena within the different circles.

Shaw was probably the first to bring some sophistication to this area after earlier work by Breckenridge and Abbott (1912). He first studied Chicago (1929) and then with McKay (1931) applied the techniques to delinquency distribution in Philadelphia, Richmond, Cleveland, Birmingham, Denver, and Seattle. Shaw and McKay found that the crime rate tended to be higher in the center of a city than near its periphery, that these high rate areas were characterized by deterioration and declining population, and that recidivism was most frequent in the high rate areas. The first two findings received the most attention and led to the generalization that delinquency is a function of an area's change from residential to commercial. This particular type of area is called an interstitial area, and it was theorized that the pressures of change somehow led to delinquency.

Needless to say, there are some obvious flaws in this type of research. The data of Shaw and McKay were based on reports of delinquent behavior, not court convictions. Also, there was no correction factor for such influences as the distribution of police across the city or the predominant ethnic background in the areas. Perhaps the most serious criticism of this work is that statistical tests were not used in most analyses. When such tests were employed by Robison (1960), the only difference that reached significance occurred between the two extreme areas of a city.

This research on high delinquency areas led to some interesting work with a focus on the individual, such as that by Reckless, Dinitz, and Murray (1956) and Lander (1954). Reckless and his colleagues began their study by asking the obvious question generated by delinquency area studies: Why don't all juveniles who reside in high delinquency areas become delinquent? What "insulates" some juveniles from the influence of their delinquent peers?

Reckless *et al.* had sixth-grade teachers list the male students most and least likely to get into trouble. They then set out to determine from official records whether these characterizations of the boys were accurate. When they had documented the fact that the boys were either "good" or "bad," the task of accounting for this judgment began. It was concluded that a boy who feels accepted and is reinforced in this feeling by his parents and teachers is most likely to remain a "good" boy regardless of his neighborhood. Thus, the theory of a well-developed self-concept as insulation against the temptations of delinquency was developed.

Lander (1954) used a slightly different approach to explain the findings of delinquency area studies and hypothesized that the important concept was one of anomie. He correlated frequencies of delinquency with characteristics of individuals (nativity, color, and so forth) and characteristics of households (for example, ownership or rent) and then factor analyzed the resulting matrix. From these correlations he extracted two factors: an "economic" factor, which included characteristics of individuals and some housing variables, and an "anomic" factor, which included delinquency rate, home ownership rate, and white-to-other rate. Lander believed that the latter factor was related to the general disruption of a neighborhood and that anomie accounted for the differences in delinquency rates.

This work, because of some of its obvious ambiguities and inadequacies, has received considerable criticism. Robison (1960) criticizes it for using official statistics of delinquency offenses and for assuming that home ownership is a clear-cut variable. Greenwood (1956) has criticized Lander for the circularity of using anomie in the prediction of delinquency. Perhaps the best documented summary of the issues involved is by Gordon (1967), who reviewed the argument between those who maintain indicators of anomie are more important than indicators of socioeconomic status and those who claim the reverse. He discusses the various statistical errors (misuse of partial correlation, regression, factor analysis, and mixed cutting point indices) and concludes that the relationship between socioeconomic status and delinquency is very strong. Gordon contends that others who have not found this relationship have misused statistics and ignored the extremely low end of the socioeconomic status range. It is the end of the range, he argues, that makes the relationship.

Maccoby, Johnson, and Church (1958) included attitudes, values, and behavior in their comparisons of high and low delinquency areas in Boston. They found that high delinquency areas tended to be less "integrated," that is, residents did not like the area as well, did not know their neighbors as well, and did not feel they had as much in common with their neighbors. Residents of the two areas did not differ in their evaluation of the seriousness of various delinquent acts. The most interesting finding was that residents of low delinquency areas were slightly more likely to do something to prevent a delinquent act, or to report one they had observed, than were residents of the high delinquency area. These findings constitute one of the few attempts to demonstrate the manner in which socioeconomic differences between areas are reflected in actual attitudes and behavior.

Empey and Erickson (1966) have dealt with the thorny issue of self-reported crimes and their relationship to social status. They found that not only were there a large number of undetected crimes but that the number of these violations differed little from one status level to another. Differences between the kinds of violations in various status groups, however, were found, with middle-class respondents committing the most serious acts and lower-class respondents reporting that they were inclined to smoke regularly, skip school, fight, and use narcotics. Empey and Erickson found that these differences held for delinquents in prison as well. Thus, when self-reported violations are the basic datum of a study, the results take on a different appearance.

Pine (1965) considered another variable in the relationship between delinquency and socioeconomic status. He administered a 120-item "delinquency inventory" to 683 urban high school students. Like Empey and Erickson he found that there was no relationship between status and delinquent behavior, but he did discover a strong relationship between "social mobility status" and delinquent behavior. Pine concluded that delinquency is not so much a function of an individual's present class as it is a function of the class to which he aspires or toward which he is moving.

Albert Cohen is another theorist whose early work was dominated by the concepts of role and class. He built on the thinking of Talcott Parsons in trying to explain the middle-class delinquent (1955). While it will be more appropriate to discuss Cohen's work in a later section on gang delinquency, it is relevant to note here that he believed the failure of the middle-class father to provide a salient model of masculinity was the generating mechanism of middle-class delinquency. According to Cohen, the middle-class boy is brought up in a system of feminine values and can only assure himself of his masculinity within this system by being "bad."

To summarize the aforementioned sociological approaches, it can be said that most theorists agree on the variables that seem important (physical environment, role, and social class). The problem lies in organizing these variables into a meaningful and workable explanation of delinquency.

The Effects of the Family

A long-lasting interest in the effects of the family on the delinquent has sprung from many sources. Perhaps the primary impetus for this research was psychoanalytic theory, with its emphasis on the importance of early childhood in the development of character. The possible effects of broken homes and working mothers have been of particular interest to workers in this field. Robison (1960) reports that early studies which used broken homes as the variable seemed to indicate that 30 to 50 percent of all delinquents came from broken homes, depending on such characteristics as sex, race, and age of the delinquent. Later, more sophisticated work by Shaw and McKay (1931) led them to conclude that it may not be the broken home *per se* that is of causal significance so much as the effects of discord in the family. Another important qualification of research in this area has been raised by Henderson (1968), who questions the universality of the patriarchal nuclear family. Robison (1960), after reviewing the work on broken homes, concludes:

> . . . the available evidence to date does not confirm a causal relationship between delinquent behavior and the broken home for two main reasons: First, because children who reside in households whose pattern is not the model one for middle-class white families are the ones most apt to be apprehended and labeled delinquent; and second, because the data do not reveal the differential significance of the family situation in the emotional reaction of the child (p. 112).

Upon close inspection, the "working mother" variable turns out to be just as complicated. The Gluecks (1957), in their comparative study mentioned earlier, reported very sporadic work habits in the mothers of delinquents and inferred that this would have damaging effects on the family and probably was indicative of the type of mothers they were. Obviously, there are some problems with these conclusions. Perhaps the best evaluation of this research is by Eleanor Maccoby (1958), who concludes that it is difficult to impute any causal significance to the "working mother" variable because there can be ineffective mothers who do not work, just as there can be working mothers who provide sufficient care for their children.

Another family-related variable that has received much attention over the years is that of poverty. In her review of the literature, Robison (1960) emphasized the difficulties in using poverty as an independent variable. She concluded that the only clear relationship which exists between poverty and delinquency concerns the likelihood that a juvenile's behavior will be officially dealt with. This conclusion is open to modification depending on the seriousness of the crime.

When looking for causal significance among variables such as these, the obvious solution is to change the frame of reference. As Robison (1960) states, ". . . whether poverty, broken homes, or working mothers are factors which cause delinquency depends upon the meaning the situation has for the child" (p. 116). Unfortunately, these variables have not generally been studied in such a manner.

The Gang

One of the most studied aspects of the delinquency problem concerns the gang, particularly the violent and antisocial gang. While early workers, such as Thrasher (1927), did much in the way of describing these gangs, it was not until somewhat later that viable theories of gang development and maintenance emerged. One of these early theories was proposed by Albert Cohen, mentioned earlier. His theory is based on the notion that society poses certain problems for its youth—specifically, upward mobility for lower-class youth and sex-role identification for middle-class youth—and does not provide accepted avenues for the solution of these problems. Assuming that society prefers to operate within middle-class values,

> . . . the working-class boy has his problem of adjustment and his motivation to the formation of a delinquent subculture even if his masculinity is not threatened by an early feminine identification; the middle-class boy has his problem in the area of sex-role identification and a motivation to being "bad" even if he is equipped to succeed in the area in which the working-class boy is handicapped (Cohen, 1955, p. 169).

Thus, both types are frustrated and eventually form groups of mutually frustrated youths who, in their own subculture, find some kind of solution to their problems. The gang is a subculture in that it has its own roles and folkways which differ from those of the general culture and with which it supports its members. Cohen is quick to add that this is not the only solution for such boys, others being to accept and play within the middle-class system or to adopt the "corner-boy" response which allows one to live within the middle-class system but not share the same interests.

There is some limited support for Cohen's thesis in the recent literature. Cartwright and Howard (1966) used the techniques of area research and multivariate analysis to study the neighborhood characteristics of sixteen delinquent Chicago gangs in 1960. Their methodology is too complex to summarize here, but they conclude that their results support Cohen's thesis. Briefly, they found a significant correlation between a factor of suburban characteristics and one of the stable corner-boy, and another correlation between socioeconomic status and an "authority protest" factor. Among the solutions proposed by Cohen —the roles of the corner-boy and gang member—the latter was likely to be from the lower-class.

Scarpitti (1965) used a questionnaire to assess the differing perceptions of societal values and opportunities held by delinquents and nondelinquents. He found that delinquents were more negative in their perceptions of values and opportunities than were nondelinquents, but that these negative perceptions did not necessarily result in delinquent behavior if, through other aspects of their personalities, the boys saw themselves as good or nondelinquent. Thus, Cohen's theory would seem to require modification and the inclusion of a self-concept measure as part of the explanation. As for theories of mental illness and delinquency, Scarpitti contended that it is possible to hold relatively negative perceptions of values and opportunity which are compatible with an otherwise positive or healthy picture of the self.

Another thesis based on the concept of culture conflict is that of Miller (1958), who agrees with Cohen's theory. He delineates processes that generate delinquency in the lower-class culture:

> 1. Following cultural practices which comprise essential elements of the total life pattern of lower-class culture automatically violates certain legal norms.
>
> 2. In instances where alternate avenues to similar objectives are available, the non-law-abiding avenue frequently provides a relatively greater and more immediate return for a relatively smaller investment of energy.
>
> 3. The "demand" response to certain situations recurrently engendered within lower-class culture involves the commission of illegal acts (p. 18).

Thus, he would argue, the violation of middle-class norms is a by-product of the nature of lower-class culture and not the dominant motivation for it.

Another theory, which has been more widely cited but is similar to those already mentioned, is that of E. H. Sutherland. This theory, known as the theory of differential association, is also based on the notion of social disorganization but is more explicit as to the processes by which young people become delinquent.

In summary, Sutherland's theory (Sutherland and Cressey, 1966) holds that criminal behavior is learned in a process of communication; the principal part of this learning occurs in intimate personal groups. The theory further states that the "specific direction of motives and drives is learned from definitions of the legal codes as favorable or unfavorable" (p. 82). According to the principle of differential association, "A person becomes delinquent because of an excess of definitions favorable to violation of law over definitions unfavorable to violation of law" (p. 82). In other words, if a person is exposed to criminal patterns of life for long periods of time with a corresponding lack of exposure to anticriminal patterns, he is likely to become criminal himself. Sutherland does not mention emotional disturbances and personality traits as possible bases of delinquency; in fact, he specifically denies their importance.

Sutherland and Cressey relate this theory to social disorganization in the following way. They prefer the term "differential social organization" to that of "social disorganization" but regard the two as essentially equal in descriptive power. They then explain variations in crime rates as reflections of the observation that "a group may be organized for criminal behavior or organized against criminal behavior. Most communities are organized both for criminal and anticriminal behavior, and in that sense the crime rate is an expression of the differential group organization" (p. 83).

Voss (1964) has found some support for differential association theory in his research. He studied self-reported delinquent behavior and the social behavior of the same respondents. On the basis of this research he concluded that adolescents who reported the greatest amount of delinquent behavior also associated extensively with delinquent friends. Those respondents who had minimal contact with delinquent peers were those who reported the lesser amount of delinquent behavior.

Erickson and Empey (1965) related self-reported crimes to social class, delinquent associates, and peer expectations toward breaking the law. They found that the social class variable was least important in predicting delinquency; delinquent associates and a commitment to peer expectations were much more predictive. Here again is support for differential association theory.

The main focus of criticism toward differential association theory has consisted of the phrase "excess of definitions" and the alleged difficulty in interpreting the theory. Some writers, like Glaser (1956), have criticized it for implying only face-to-face interactions and, thus, for being superficial. Glaser suggests the term "identification" rather than association to emphasize the idea that it is not only face-to-face relationships that have an effect on adolescents. Burgess and Akers (1966) have attempted to use other mechanisms from psychology to make this particular aspect of the theory more workable. They suggest that the concept of reinforcement has the necessary explanatory power, with operant learning theory as the explanation of how delinquent behavior is learned.

Sykes and Matza (1957) have taken a different tack through this conceptual maze. They disagree with Cohen's concept of a delinquent subculture on the grounds that if the concept were valid there would be no delinquents who showed any guilt or shame. Since this is not true, they argue, delinquents must not be totally committed to a reversal of middle-class values; thus, the basis of a subculture is disproven. Sykes and Matza assert that guides to behavior can be obeyed and disobeyed simultaneously, given the right mechanisms of justification. This, they claim, is the process implied in Sutherland's phrase "definitions favorable to the violation of law," except that they prefer to call them "techniques of neutralization." Sykes and Matza list the following five denial mechanisms used by delinquents to neutralize the effects of their offenses: (1) denial of responsibility, (2) denial of injury, (3) denial of the victim, (4) condemnation of the condemners, and (5) appeal to higher loyalties.

Most of the theories that refer to subcultures, gangs, and age groups, and to the different values and motives of these groups, are related to the general sociological viewpoint known as symbolic interaction theory. This theory focuses on the verbalizations in social behavior as representations of norms, values, rationalizations, rules, and so forth. The process of learning behavior is influenced by the persons with whom and groups with which an individual interacts. The theoretical entity of the self-concept is important to this view since self-concept is developed and changed by interactions with others through communication symbols (i.e., verbalizations). Following this line of reasoning, Fannin and Clinard (1965) used interviews and forced-choice scales in an attempt to compare the self-conceptions of lower and lower-middle-class boys. They found that while the self-conceptions were similar, the lower-class boys saw themselves as being "tougher, more fearless, powerful, fierce, and dangerous," and lower-middle-class boys saw themselves as being "more clever, smart, smooth, bad, and loyal." Not only did Fannin and Clinard find different self-concepts for these two groups of boys, but they also found that these self-concepts were differentially related to specific behavior patterns. From these findings they drew some tempting hypotheses for rehabilitative and preventive programs:

> Self-conception may act as a closure factor restricting the possibilities of behavior to a narrowed universe. Direct programs toward changing this aspect of the self-conception might prove more helpful than a global effort at pervasive personality change (Fannin and Clinard, 1965, p. 213).

There are a number of possible confounding influences in Fannin's and Clinard's original study, such as the effects of ethnic group and class membership. More work is needed to document the possibility that different self-concepts lead to different types of behavior before this theory can be broadly applied.

Lerman (1967) has also contributed to the symbolic interactionist point of view. His approach was to attempt to show that much potential data is lost by focusing attention on the gang alone. He maintained that support for the symbolic interactionist position was much more widespread. After his study of symbolic deviance, primarily through language usage and social interaction patterns, he concluded that there were distinct referents for the cultural and social boundaries of a deviant youth culture. Lerman further stated that the social unit of this kind of subculture is a network of pairs, triads, and groups, with and without names. Thus, there is more to delinquent subcultures than gangs alone.

Schools and Mass Media

A traditional approach to the causation of delinquency has included indictments of the educational system and such media as movies, comic books, and television. Here the entities to be studied include truancy, lax discipline, and violence.

While much work has focused on truancy as being the first step toward a delinquent career, there seems to be little support for this view (Robison, 1960). In a recent study by Elliot (1966), in fact, there is evidence of a completely different trend. He gathered data on over 700 tenth-grade boys in a large Western city and followed them up for a three-year period. Both of the following hypotheses were supported: (1) the rate of delinquency is higher for boys who are in school than for those out of school, and (2) delinquents who dropped out of school had a greater delinquency rate while they were enrolled than after they left. This data would seem to question the traditionally assumed relationship between truancy and delinquency and to support Roser's (1951) redefinition of truancy as school resistance.

Researchers have been even less successful in arriving at any conclusions about the effects of movies, comics, and television programs that depict violence. Robison's (1960) summary still holds. She wrote:

> There is . . . no consensus among the experts as to the effect on delinquency of any of the mass media of communication, and no well-documented scientific study in this admittedly important field has yet been published (p. 160).

ANTHROPOLOGICAL THEORIES

A few theories of delinquency have been proposed by those of an anthropological bent. Typically, these theorists emphasize the importance of a shared culture, the effects of a changing culture (for example, the change from a rural to an urban culture), the effects of various ethnic backgrounds when an individual is confronted with a "melting pot" such as the United States, and so forth.

It is not feasible here to review all the studies that have concerned the relationship between religious affiliation and delinquency. Many studies, of various qualities, have been done, but few have had any impact on the problem of delinquency. As Robison (1960) concluded:

> . . . studies . . . have indicated a relatively lower rate of crime and delinquency among white Protestants and Jews than among Catholics. Since religious affiliation has not been proven to affect the individual's disposition toward crime or delinquency, other factors associated with members of the various religious groups must be used to explain the differing incidence of delinquency and crime in these groups (p. 168).

Among the factors that she mentions are the differential distribution of social classes in the different religions, the differing sanctions each religion places on criminal behavior, and recency of immigration.

One factor that has led to the study of ethnic groups, and thus of culture, has been the repeated observation that migrants and immigrants are overrepresented in the statistics of crime and delinquency. According to Robison (1960), there have been four kinds of attempts to explain this observation: (1) anomie, (2) culture conflict, (3) our frontier history, and (4) some type of multiple causation.

R. K. Merton (1949) is the proponent of the anomie theory, which is very similar to the anomie explanation mentioned earlier with regard to delinquent subcultures. He contends that while the United States places great emphasis on materialistic goals, it gives migrants and immigrants little opportunity for achieving these goals. Merton further claims that this explanation accounts for the low incidence of delinquency among Jews and Chinese, who have such well-structured education for their young that their futures are made clear for them. This, he notes, is not true for minorities such as the Puerto Ricans, Negroes, and Mexicans. Obviously, as an explanatory concept anomie fares no better here than it did earlier. It is difficult to transform it past the level of description.

Neither has the explanation of culture conflict been very useful. Generally, according to Robison (1960), it has been assumed that somehow exposure to new culture patterns would cause dissent and tensions between immigrant parent and native offspring which would eventually result in delinquency on the part of the child. She believes that at the present time this argument must be refuted since there is little evidence of such conflict.

The third possible explanation, that of frontier mores, has even less explanatory potential. The main contention of this theory is that America has always been, in some respects, a lawless country. Given that fact, how can we expect it to change? An interesting view, but it is little more than a backdrop.

The last general idea—the call for theories based on multiple causation—is probably the most potentially viable. In spite of all the work that followed Wilkins' review (1963), its conclusion is still valid. He wrote, "None of the factors discovered in any of the studies to date have been demonstrated causes of delinquency. To this extent it might well be concluded that the causes of delinquency remain unknown" (p. 116).

Hirschi and Selvin (1966), in their argument for multiple causation theories, list three criteria that are yet to be met. These are (1) some correlation between variables, (2) independent variables with causal priority, and (3) a lack of spuriousness in the results. At this time all that can be said is that it is very likely that cultural and subcultural features provide the context for learning and early family training. These features interact with heredity, peer relationships, and physical environments to contribute to the cause and continuance of delinquent behavior.

SUMMARY

This chapter presents a brief overview of various studies concerned with the etiology of delinquency. The studies are quite heterogeneous and reflect the fields of interest of the individual investigators. For purposes of clear presentation, they are grouped as follows: (1) classical, (2) psychological, (3) sociological, and (4) anthropological. Because of the diverse nature of the studies, no attempt is made to integrate their various results. Hopefully, however, the review demonstrates the complexity of the interaction of variables which contribute to criminal behavior.

3

BARRIERS TO REHABILITATION

Although a considerable amount of research has been devoted to examining the causes of delinquent behavior, few concrete facts have emerged from the plethora of opinion. Perhaps this is one reason why prisons have been, in a large number of cases, unsuccessful in their attempts to rehabilitate offenders; it is exceedingly more difficult to deal with a problem if its causes are unknown.

The lack of specific information about the causes of criminal behavior has been coupled with a lack of information about the function of the prison in the process of inmate rehabilitation. Personal experience, sociological observation, and questionnaire and interview techniques are all that the social sciences have yet been able to contribute to the study of prison existence. Nevertheless, these methods are valuable in their own right, pointing the way to areas which must be studied more rigorously. Gottfredson (1967), discussing the information bases for evaluating correctional programs, concludes that the situation is "deplorable" because social scientists know so little about what is happening in the rehabilitative process or how to measure it. According to Glaser (1964), "Prisons must operate like businesses without bookkeeping, in blissful ignorance of the extent of their profit or loss" (p. 16).

After many years of studying penal systems, Cressey (1968) has also concluded that we know little about rehabilitating people; we do not know if punitiveness works, or if it is inefficient or blatantly erroneous. Most techniques used in penology today have not been proved either effective or ineffective and are only vaguely related to existing theories of behavior and criminology. Since many group or clinical techniques are infeasible because of physical and staff limitations, Cressey maintains that there is a desperate need to find a treatment based on theories of behavior that can be cheaply and routinely administered by nonprofessional staff.

The following attempt to unravel the effects of prison life on the inmate and his rehabilitation is based on the facts available today—facts which leave much room for interpretation. In order to make more sense out of the field of corrections, to ground practice soundly in theories of behavior, as Cressey suggests, this analysis is founded in certain assumptions about the nature of human beings—assumptions revealed in the theories of psychologists Harry Stack Sullivan, Carl R. Rogers, Abraham H. Maslow, Erich Fromm, and others. The central tenet of these convictions, one common to many theories of clinical psychology, is that positive growth is natural and inevitable for all men who are free from overwhelming internal and external fears, frustrations, and threats to the self. In practice, this means that rehabilitation must be a positive building process rather than a negative, destructive one.

This chapter is an attempt to identify and describe the features of a security-oriented prison which appear to be most antithetical to rehabilitation. It is recognized that these features, which seem so opposed to positive growth, may "reform" some inmates. This type of reform, however, seems to be the same kind that takes place when a child touches a hot stove. The experience is so painful that the individual never exposes himself to it again, but this is punishment, not rehabilitation.

The kinds of barriers to rehabilitation described herein—the barrenness and deprivation, the regimentation and scrutinization, the pernicious delinquent inmate subculture, the corruption of authority, the racism, the authoritarian bureaucracy—are not typical of all prisons; in fact, they are typical of fewer institutions today than twenty years ago. Yet hundreds of security-oriented institutions are still characterized by these obstacles to rehabilitation.

It should be stressed that the studies discussed in this chapter were conducted in every type of correctional setting—from maximum security institutions for criminals with several convictions to residential treatment centers for youth. It is not implied that all of the conditions discussed are characteristic of all prisons.

Although it is true that correctional practices are advancing, that enlightened treatment-oriented prisons are emerging in ever larger numbers, there is no room for complacency. The need for change is still staggering. Many limited rehabilitative efforts are being attempted even in the most custody-oriented institutions; yet these projects face overwhelming challenges because of the antirehabilitative atmospheres in which they must function. The purpose of the present chapter is to illuminate those aspects of custodial prisons which may negate the results of rehabilitative efforts.

THE ENCAPSULATED MAN—PHYSICAL AND PSYCHIC BOUNDARIES

The ever-present physical and regimentative barriers within correctional institutions inevitably shape the whole process of rehabilitation. As many of the more dramatic portrayals of life in custodial prisons indicate, the prisoner is stripped, scrubbed, shaved, deprived, caged, and regimented—a process which reflects medieval assumptions which plague the field of corrections today.

In any prison which serves as a total institution, or as a "container," the inescapable prison environment reminds the inmate constantly and insistently that he is a social reject, unfit for the company of free society. He is isolated with fellow "untouchables," confined by cold institutional walls, endless empty corridors, austere and imposing bars, and contained by the threat of violence and force. All aspects of individuality are expunged as the prisoner trades his civilian appearance for the prison uniform, closely-cropped hair, and cleanshaven face and relinquishes all private possessions.

The prison is overwhelmingly drab—the naked light bulb, the ugly, bare radiators. The public cell-cage with stark bunk and bare toilet provides no hiding place from watchful, suspicious eyes. The regimentation of all human activity, including eating and using the toilet, strips the prisoner of all external manifestations of humanity and leaves him stimulus-deprived, bored, and defenseless. Everywhere the layer upon layer of walls, bars, barriers, rules, and regulations encapsulate the personality as well as the physical being.

According to sociologist Erving Goffman (1961), this deprivation of all meaningful manifestations of the self in total institutions (such as prisons and mental hospitals) is extremely functional from the standpoint of the institution. He comments that the "prepatient's career" starts with relationships and rights, liberties and satisfactions, and ends (at the beginning of the inmate's stay) with hardly any of these—a process most fittingly called "stripping." In Goffman's terms, these assaults on the self, this process of mortification, are rationalized in the name of the mortifying power itself for purposes of security, health, and other goals which frequently sound reasonable. The main objective of such mortification is to ensure that the person's individuality is totally subservient to the needs of the institution, so that he never erupts in unnecessary and messy humanness which might disrupt the efficient, changeless system.

Gresham Sykes (1958) contends that this regimentation and stark environmental deprivation are evidence that bureaucratic personality types have "elevated a means to the status of an end." Deprivation and regulation become goals themselves; any historical endeavor to relate this suffering to rehabilitation has long since disappeared, and any true rehabilitative potential of prisons is untapped.

Deprivation in prison strips the convict of many of the measures of success and sources of security to which the free individual has access and serves as another means of castigation by society. In his study of a maximum security prison in New Jersey, Sykes (1958, 1966) found that the central problem which inmates face is deprivation—deprivation of material goods and heterosexual gratification, denial of autonomy and individuality, and loss of freedom and social acceptance. Material deprivation in prison has many ramifications in our culture, which bases so much of the estimation of success and prestige upon possessions. The normal social patterns and sources of security are disrupted by isolation from loved ones and from heterosexual relationships. (Clemmer [1940] found that sexual deprivation was the most painful loss among prisoners he interviewed.) Questions of sexual identity are disturbing for men (especially adolescents) who have no contact with women to bolster their self-concepts. Thus, homosexuality, both chronic and occasional, is common and may be accompanied by serious psychological problems. Deprivation of autonomy and liberty is threatening because it reduces the prisoner to the status of a child, disturbing his self-image. Committal to prison implicitly deprives a man of social acceptance, of his status as a "trusted" member of the community. He must, therefore, turn to fellow outcasts for the acceptance necessary for self-preservation.

A natural complement to the drabness, austerity, and confining milieu of the prison are the rules and regulations which ensure that even within his narrow and dull living space, a convict has no responsibility or self-determination. As Clemmer (1940) points out, rules govern everything from table manners to work habits to communication with others. Sykes (1958) calls this total system of regulation "a blueprint for behavior," an attempt to impose a rigid social order on all of those contained within the institution. The authoritarian system backs up these rules with threats of force and deprivation—withdrawal of privileges or "good time"—and confinement to solitary. The gun and the stick are the ever-present reminder and enforcer. Obedience, superficial compliance, and/or corruption of the system are the only alternatives open to prisoners who wish to maintain their few privileges and rights.

The loss of sense of self is further emphasized by the dehumanizing routine which turns men into cogs, numbers, and bodies, stripping them of all freedom and, thus, of responsibility (the exercise of conscience and judgment which is essential to positive human growth) and makes them totally dependent upon the institution. Eldridge Cleaver (1968) vividly describes the effects of prison on the identity of the individual, characterizing this loss of self as a "numbness," "atrophy," "emptiness," and "deadness":

> . . . it is very easy for one in prison to lose his sense of self. And if he has been undergoing all kinds of extreme, involved, and un-

> regulated changes then he ends up not knowing who he is. . . . Individuality is not nourished in prison, neither by the officials nor by the convicts. It is a deep hole out of which to climb (p. 16).

Maintaining one's identity is a never-ending struggle. Clemmer (1940) points out that the way one wears his cap and grooms himself can become terribly important to a man who has limited ways of expressing his identity and his individuality. For those with meager defenses and fragile egos, this loss of the external trappings of "person" may be crushing and disorienting, a disorganizing rather than a constructive experience.

Research indicates that lack of stimulation can have serious deteriorating effects on the human personality. The sensory deprivation studies of Heron (1958), Lilly (1958), and Kubzansky (1961) indicate that a total lack of stimulation can be extremely disorienting, causing impairment of reasoning ability, distortion of perceptions, hallucinatory experiences, a tendency to become unusually suggestible (as in brainwashing), disorientation in time and space, disorientation of thoughts, confusion of feelings and emotions, paranoid feelings and fears, and intensive panic. Allowing the subject to be active decreases these effects. The findings mentioned above occurred under conditions of almost total sensory deprivation with voluntary subjects who could terminate the experiment at any time. Could more long-term, nonvoluntary, and uncontrollable deprivation of a far less severe nature (as in prisons) have similar effects?

Clemmer (1940) points out that daydreaming, paranoid delusions, and a tendency to withdraw are common in prisons. In this restricted, monotonous, and static environment, 15 to 20 percent of the prison population indulges in "reverie-plus" to some degree. This "reverie-plus," or prison stupor, is a function of two conditions—an introverted personality and the institutional environment. It abounds in self-reference and frequently concerns sexuality, but seldom focuses on criminal or penal life. It becomes one avenue of escape from the intolerable situation in which the prisoner finds himself. As Clemmer sees it, reverie, gambling, and drinking homemade brew are to be expected from individuals with a "paucity of interests"—a common problem among inmates.

Cressey (1965) points out that "treatment leads to regimentation and routine that makes men unfit for life outside the institution." Prisons should be places where socially disruptive individuals learn to be responsible, capable, and constructive citizens who may safely be returned to the community. How does such a milieu—the barrenness, the regimentation and scrutinization, the implicit threat of force—foster these goals?

SOCIAL PRESSES ON INMATE LIFE SPACE

One of the most curious and perplexing aspects of prison life is that many complex and contradictory patterns of social interaction exist simultaneously. At the same time that prisoners may be alienated from each other and think only of themselves, the forces of the peer group may bring pressures upon them to be cohesive at least to some degree: while inmates prey upon each other, they are united in their hatred of those who have jailed and contained them. The prison guard and the inmate are on opposite sides of the battle front, but they cooperate to some extent in that special privileges and authority are given to those inmates who are cohesive leaders and keep the prison running smoothly. The explanation for this phenomenon is relatively simple: all of these individuals (both inmates and guards) need satisfaction and are engulfed in the total institution of the prison which limits their interactions, and all are dependent in some way or another upon each other. While the elements of antagonism, power, and exploitation are disjoining forces, they also have positive facets. Antagonism toward one group breeds a certain solidarity in others. The desire for power which must somehow be distributed between inmates and officials is the source of a great deal of cohesion between otherwise opposing groups. Imprisonment is more bearable if one can spend it in the company of others with whom he feels some form of solidarity. This mutual dependence for the satisfaction of needs leads to forms of cohesion at the same time that other forces are pulling various groups apart.

Because it is difficult to characterize the prison community in definitive terms, each of the following sections will attempt to treat one of the possible forms of relationships which may exist in the prison. The reader must constantly bear in mind all of the other complicated processes which are operating simultaneously.

The Subjugated Group: Deviant Milieu

Isolation and Neutralization of "Outside" Relationships. The convicted criminal—who, according to the standards of the larger society, suffers from a deficiency in socialization—is isolated from healthy relationships with family, friends, and responsible citizens and is thrown into the deviant subculture of prison life. As Goffman (1961) points out, total institutions are basically incompatible with the structures of society which play the most meaningful role in a productive, responsible life—that is, work and family. Thus, the prisoner is alienated from constructive channels of expression and development. Many studies (for example, Glaser, 1964; Clemmer, 1940) have indicated that prison tends to disrupt meaningful, stabilizing relationships with individuals outside the institution. For most men, the longer they remain in prison, the less likely they are to find their immediate nuclear families (wives and children) intact, and the more they must rely on blood relatives for support.

Clemmer (1940) observes that the prison culture seeks to preserve itself by alienating inmates from the outside culture. When a man enters prison, he can develop positive relationships with a majority of the prison inmates if he responds positively to inmate values and attitudes toward life. A man with close ties to the outside world—friends, family, religion or other values—clashes with the subculture and develops negative relationships on levels where the two cultures clash. Conflicts tend to arise in the mores, customs of conduct, or values rather than in the minor aspects of daily life. Those who are partly assimilated have the greatest difficulty; their behavior seems confused and illogical to other inmates who cling tenaciously to one culture or the other. They may comply with authority in some cases but not in others, thus causing resentment. Within the prison culture, a prisoner must go "all the way" to be accepted.

Healthy, rehabilitative relationships, however, can develop among prisoners if the peer group is motivated toward rehabilitation. Wilkins (1964) found that "good risks" (men who were likely to be rehabilitated in prison) were better risks when concentrated with other good risks, and "bad risks" were worse when concentrated with bad risks. Bowman (1960) has found similar results with underachieving children. The social climate of the prison contributes significantly to post-release success or failure.

Glaser (1964), in his extensive study of federal prisons, concludes that contacts with meaningful others can compete successfully with the influence of the peer group. Post-release success depends, in part, upon the absence of conflict with those with whom the ex-convict lives, be they relatives or others. Glaser also observes that the progression from the dependency of adolescence to the independence of adult life may account for the decline in post-release failure that is associated with increases in age. More important, perhaps, is a shift in reference groups from the adolescent to the adult world. Glaser is convinced that a prisoner can identify with and assimilate middle-class values only when he has meaningful relationships with responsible, caring adults who respect and cherish middle-class values and have succeeded in life through the conventional channels.

Cressey (1954) points out that because criminality is a social problem, social relationships are of primary importance. Therefore, the criminal must develop new relationships which change the social patterns of his life and his interactions with individuals and society. In custodial prisons, however, the contact with noncriminal individuals is limited to the custodial staff and to an occasional member of the treatment staff. Considering the inmate-staff ratio at most prisons today, it is understandably difficult for an inmate to develop a relationship of sufficient depth to overcome his criminal ties.

The Pervasive Peer Group or the "Atomized" Society? Instead of forming potentially constructive ties with socially adjusted individuals, the criminal spends his incarcerated life in a group consisting of "custodial and professional employees, habitual petty thieves, onetime offenders, gangsters, professional racketeers, psychotics, prepsychotics, neurotics, and psychopaths, all living under extreme conditions of physical and psychological compression" (McCorkle and Korn, 1954, p. 88).

The prison society is, in a real sense, schizophrenic; it may be characterized both as a pervasive criminogenic peer group (Sykes, 1958) and as an "atomized society" (Clemmer, 1940). Numerous penologists who are convinced of one or the other interpretation refute each other with a multitude of observations and questionnaires. As was pointed out at the beginning of this section, many conflicting social forces operate on the prison community to develop cohesion and to tear it apart. First, many convicts are mistrustful, self-serving, and exploitative of others. Also, staying away from the peer group or actually keeping fellow inmates in line for the staff may help one to acquire privileges and a quick release. Fear and suspicion are rampant in the prison and tend to splinter the subculture. The "do your own time" ethic, espoused by prisoners and guards alike, encourages the inmate to isolate himself from others.

Cohesive influences on inmate life stem from several factors: first, younger inmates are still involved in the adolescent peer group and are so cohesive that the peer group frequently constitutes an antirehabilitative force. Secondly, the inmate, faced with the rejection of society and the deprivation and regimentation at the hands of the prison staff, is likely to regard the staff as an enemy and thus unite with his peers, at least in terms of a common hate object. Also, the prison code of ethics, though frequently broken, encourages inmate loyalty and a traditional antistaff orientation. Thus, the issue is extremely complicated, and every prison—indeed every prisoner—must be examined in terms of all the complex interactions which may exist.

A substantial body of literature in penology is devoted to an examination of the prison social structure. These studies indicate that the inmate community is an aggregate of men who can be categorized as either grouped or ungrouped (more or less solitary), who exist in a stratified society with a definite pecking order characterized by the exploitation of those of lower status and lesser defenses by those in power (Clemmer, 1940; Glaser, 1964; Polsky, 1962; Sykes, 1958).

Updating Clemmer's delineation of grouped and ungrouped men, Glaser (1964) found that 37 percent of the inmates were ungrouped and 62 percent were grouped. The older inmates are more likely to be isolated and the youngest (twenty-one years old and under) are the most socially oriented. Age at admission is the most significant factor in determining whether an inmate will be grouped or ungrouped. The more homogeneous the inmate population in terms of race, length of sentence, social class, prior confinement, and amount of correctional experience, the more group-oriented the subculture. Glaser found that many ungrouped men have close ties with family or friends on the outside and avoid trouble to gain quick release.

In fact, the predominant interest of most inmates is to adjust to the expectations of their keepers in order to stay out of trouble. Both Glaser and Clemmer indicate that most adult inmates (82 percent) are wary of "certain kinds of inmates" and tend to shy away from large numbers of contacts, concentrating on a few close friends. As a rule, relationships among prisoners are highly impersonal; most inmates are concerned only about themselves. They assume that they cannot depend on others and make no effort to assist anyone else. Because the primary purpose of groups in a prison is to make time pass as agreeably and as comfortably as possible, group loyalty is a very tenuous concept. Clemmer characterizes this lack of cohesion as the "atomized" society.

Many researchers in corrections have pointed out that the prison staff unwittingly encourages the antihuman values of prison life. To cope with this congregation of "troublemakers" and "deviants" the staff encourages prisoners to live by the old prison maxim of "do your own time"—that is, fend for yourself and don't get involved with others (Clemmer, 1940; Glaser, 1964; Sykes, 1958). This self-oriented approach was so successful in the prison studied by Clemmer (1940) that an inmate was concerned only about those matters which personally involved himself. Thus, collective action was rare.

McCleery (1968), Cloward (1968), and others have suggested that inmate leaders also promote the "do your own time" ethic in order to maintain power by fragmenting the social cohesion of other prisoners. From the average inmate's point of view, such detachment from others increases the likelihood that he will stay out of trouble, acquire privileges, and earn a speedy release.

Glaser (1964) points out that the "do your own time" ethic is antirehabilitative, the antithesis of what incarceration is supposed to accomplish, for it implies a total lack of interest in or concern for others.

Since human morality is based upon empathy for one's fellow man, this ethic encourages amorality and caters to psychopathic outlooks. Indeed, this kind of psychopathology, or lack of social consciousness, is at the root of many criminal lives. The "do your own time" ethic only compounds the antisocial character of many prisoners, encouraging a dehumanizing orientation of "everyone out for himself." Such an attitude fosters the jungle ethic of the survival of the fittest, of the strong and crafty over the weak, the gentle, and the naive.

What cohesiveness exists in the inmate subculture is maintained by an informal code of life, the mores of prison existence. As Clemmer points out, this code is derived from the universal purposes of inmate endeavor, which include freedom, noncooperation with officials (less universal), and inmate loyalty, health, and loyalty to family (even less universal).

One curious result of peer pressure and the code is that prisoners perceive other inmates as being less committed to staff-supported values than is actually the case. Cloward (1956) studied a military prison and found that although most of the men were applying for restoration to military service, each thought he was the only one doing so; pressure from inmate leaders was toward conformity to peer norms. Cloward calls such behavior "pluralistic ignorance," resulting from a fear of expression of non-inmate-conforming norms. The role of the leadership in defining the predominant values was indicated by Vinter, Janowitz, and associates (1961) in a study of six juvenile training schools. They found that in custodial institutions leaders had more negative perspective than the other inmates, while in treatment-oriented schools the leaders had more positive perspectives than their fellow prisoners.

Incarcerated juveniles and young adults are most likely to be grouped, to live by the prison code, and to be swayed by the peer group because of the primary influence of peers among adolescents in general. (Glaser found that younger prisoners are more apt to revert to crime on release and believes that this is due to peer influence. Thus, he advocates placing juveniles with older prisoners instead of peers because advice in the prison community flows down the age continuum.)

Exploitation of the Defenseless by the Powerful. Despite the forces of cohesion operating on the inmate subculture, exploitation of fellow convicts is one of the most pervasive problems of prison life. The compression of the prison existence—the fears and frustrations and resultant aggression, the exploitative nature of certain inmates, the lack of goods and services which makes force a primary means of obtaining scarce goods and gratifications—all contribute to the vicious cycle of aggression and exploitation.

Given the compression of the custodial prison, hatred and frustration are psychologically inevitable. Studies of group processes by French (1944), Lewin (1948), and others indicate parameters of frustration and aggression which are implicit in prison existence. Psychologist Kurt Lewin (1948), who spent years studying group dynamics, points out that both group and individual frustration result from the following conditions: need hunger (unfulfilled needs), a lack of space for free movement (lack of alternatives), outer or inner barriers to "escape," contradictory goals, and/or an oversatiation of activities (boredom and irritation with frequently repeated acts). The custodial prison provides every one of these conditions without allowing outlets for the resultant frustrations. Most clinical psychologists and psychiatrists would agree with psychiatrist Karl Menninger (1966) that the repression of instincts, feelings, and attitudes only leads to more intense, contained, potentially explosive feelings which must erupt eventually.

The inmate exists in a brutalized and brutalizing world; it is a jungle existence which requires constant wariness and treachery. Survival of the fittest and exploitation of the weak are the all-pervasive rules of prison life. The strong intimidate and threaten the defenseless in order to acquire contraband, favors, and sexual partners; inmates who turn to the prison staff for help are mercilessly punished. The prison staff tends to "overlook" much of this bullying because in doing so they can depend upon the powerful inmates to keep others in line, to maintain the status quo—for the prisoner with great power frequently has much to lose in the event of a shake-up in the prison.

Aggression is the predominant mode of expression and interrelation in the prison environment. According to French (1944), any group can become aggressive under the stresses of fear and/or frustration. Frustration varies directly with motivation and frequently produces aggression. When aggression toward others is aimed at "interfering agents," social restraint may inhibit it and decrease the ratio of direct to indirect aggressions. In the prison environment, where fear and frustration are widespread, the potential controls on aggression suggested by French (motivation and social restraint) are absent; while frustration and interfering agents (custodial and professional personnel and fellow prisoners who have conflicting goals and motivations) are constantly present.

Many students of prison life (Sykes, 1958; Schrag, 1961; Glaser, 1964; and Glaser and Stratton, 1961) have discovered hierarchies in the inmate social structure. These consist of the exploiters and the victims, the defiant and the submissive. For example, Sykes found the following pecking order in a New Jersey prison: the "gorilla" extorts goods and favors by threat of force. The "merchant" sells contraband instead of giving (the common exchange method). The inmate culture itself emphasizes adjustments and thus unwittingly helps maintain the status *quo*. Consequently, the "tough" who terrorizes his fellows is more respected (as well as feared) than the "ball buster" who defies the "screws" (guards), thereby threatening the subterranean relationship between guards and inmates. The "hipster" tries to belong but doesn't and is disliked. "Rats" and establishment men are hated because they destroy inmate unity and security. The "real man" is the loyal good guy who keeps the lid on. Toughness and stamina rather than heterosexual activities become the proof of manhood. Prisoners value endurance, self-restraint, reserve, taciturnity, and emotional balance—the "dignity" of the American cowboy and gangster hero.

The system balances between cohesion and extortion. The cohesively-oriented inmate is rewarded by the staff, and this bolsters his influence. Trouble occurs when a violent man emerges, when a powerful, cohesion-oriented inmate loses his power, or when there are attempts to alter the power base (for example, a guard who tries to assert authority in areas where he has previously been lax).

Those who do not extort, who have not contrived to hustle or brutalize fellow inmates are the victims. Those who cannot defend themselves live in constant fear and capitulation. Those who dominate learn only to take more from other men, to exploit all the more cleverly and mercilessly. The harsh reality of this system of predators and prey was dramatically documented by Davis (1968), who uncovered numerous cases of sexual assaults in the Philadelphia prisons and even in the sheriff's vans (especially assaults by older men upon young boys). From personal experience Eldridge Cleaver (1968) maintains that paranoia is the common lot of the prisoner, who constantly fears the sabotage of other inmates and spends most of his psychic energy on the petty intrigue necessary for survival.

Few studies have dealt with the social structure of institutions for "incorrigible" delinquent youths; however, Polsky's participant observation (1962) of the "toughest" cottage for the most unmanageable youths at a minimum security home gives some excellent and discouraging clues to the kinds of social interactions which probably prevail in the daily environment of many incarcerated delinquents. He found an "aggression-oriented culture" with a distinct hierarchy of power and status and a ruthless pecking order where the youths were constantly preoccupied with their positions in the group. "The constant projection of one's anxieties (over sex, dominance, etc.) and frustrations upon others below and above one's status created a vicious circle which leads to aggression against boys weaker than oneself" (p. 53). Members learned to conform to prevailing group norms by five deviant interactive modes: (1) aggression, (2) deviant skills and activities (manipulation), (3) threat gestures, (4) ranking (obscenities, name calling), and (5) scapegoating. "Ultimate authority in the delinquent world rested upon tough boys dominating inferior boys by physical force" (p. 57). Violence was the great "unequalizer."

The social structure included the following role behaviors: (1) toughs (leaders); (2) "con-artists"; (3) quiet types; (4) bush boys (punks); and (5) scapegoats. Power was reshuffled through physical struggles whenever one of the leaders left. The pathologies of the leaders were inflicted upon those lower in the ranks through force and were reinforced by the deviant subculture. Boys of lower status turned aggression inward, and deviant behavior was a vital component in the equilibrium of cottage social organization. The omnipresent tough-weak continuum fed the lack of alternative identifications. Even the observer had difficulty maintaining his own integrity and values despite his security as a member of the outer society! For the boys there was no alternative to the deviant subculture.

Polsky concluded that it was virtually impossible for therapeutic treatment to succeed because of the pervasive influence of the peer group and the way in which the institution interacted with the deviant subculture. The treatment staff had no conception of the real, terrible issues of jungle life outside their offices, and the cottage parents and other custodial personnel actually assimilated the values of the deviant subculture, recognizing the status differentiations and accepting the commerce of violence.

The influence of violence on prison life cannot be overemphasized. Sands (1964) vividly depicts the terrifying, stifling atmosphere of violence which characterizes prison existence:

> Everywhere, every minute—like the air you breathe—there is the threat of violence lurking beneath the surface. Unlike the air, it is heavy, massive, as oppressive as molasses. It permeates every second of everyone's existence—the potential threat of sudden, ferocious annihilation. It is as grey and swift and unpredictable as a shark and just as unvocal (p. 53).

Racism in Prisons. In addition to the social stratification as captive or captor, as grouped or ungrouped, as exploiter or exploited, prisoners are divided ferociously and uncompromisingly by race, according to the personal reports of black men who have been incarcerated (Cleaver, 1968; Malcolm X, 1964). Yet, curiously enough, there is little in the literature on prisons concerning either inmate or staff racism; some authors casually mention it and promptly skirt the issue. Thus, the researcher must turn to the subjective accounts of imprisoned black men to glean some inkling of the problem.

Racism is a fact of life in American society, especially among those who have yet to "make it" or who have just barely "made it" in terms of the socioeconomic stratification of Western culture. Inmates who are recruited from the ranks of these two groups are very likely to be exponents of racist attitudes. As many prominent sociologists, psychologists, and authors have pointed out, the poor white man (such as the typical white inmate), perceiving himself at the bottom of the social ladder, can build his own self-image only by disparaging someone else and placing him even lower on the scale. The black man is the logical target because of his socioeconomic conditions. Due to social changes, however, the black man is also a threat since he is now better able to compete with these low-income whites for the constantly decreasing number of unskilled and semiskilled jobs.

Thus, racism is most rampant among the poor white population. For those in lower level occupations, such as prison guards, the problem is similar. Many of them come from low-income backgrounds or from immigrant stock and have fought their way up to their present status by hard work and sacrifice. They frequently must compete directly with blacks trying to move into their neighborhoods or jobs. Their attitude tends to be "I made it by hard work, and anyone else can if he tries," and they resent welfare and other programs directed at those still living in poverty.

In prison, racial antagonisms probably affect the dispensation of privileges and favors, inmate-staff contacts, contacts among inmates, and the compassion or brutality with which the individual is treated. In short, racism may well color the entire life of the convict.

Militant blacks, such as Eldridge Cleaver, view themselves as political prisoners who have been wronged far more by society than they have wronged it. They resent imprisonment and view it as oppression by the white man rather than mere punishment. In Cleaver's (1968) own scathing words, black convicts do not view themselves as criminals, but rather as "prisoners of war, the victims of a vicious dog-eat-dog social system that is so heinous as to cancel out their own malefactions" (p. 58). In the jungle there is no right or wrong; prisoners believe that they are being abused and oppressed rather than that they are paying a "debt to society." Thus, militants are not likely to be "rehabilitated" on the terms of the white prison staff—that is, be good, be quiet, go along with the social order, and don't try to change anything.

Although documentation is lacking, the Black Muslims are reputed to have been successful in converting and rehabilitating blacks from a life of crime to a life of devotion to the Muslims and to the mobilization of black manpower for community action and a separate society. That the Muslims may be more successful than prisons at rehabilitating blacks might indicate that penology has much to learn from a faith which gives a black man deep pride in his race and himself and thus motivates him for the good of the black community.

Precarious Authority and Pernicious Bureaucracy

The Authoritarian/Bureaucratic Balance. The custodial prison is one of the most all-encompassing of total institutions (places characterized by barriers to social intercourse with outsiders, where all aspects of life—sleep, self-maintenance, play, and work—are carried on with the same people). Such institutions, by their nature, tend to develop complex patterns of power conservation and manipulation and vast bureaucratic mazes which most often neutralize innovative concepts that might upset the applecart—for better or worse.

The inadequacies of custodial prisons and the earnest desire for change are well documented, but resistance to innovation is frequently entrenched in the bureaucracy, staffing patterns, and power structure of total institutions. Unfortunately, there is little documented study of this problem in the literature; it is, therefore, necessary to turn to pertinent studies of the public schools, which provide an analogous situation in many respects (although schools, as more "open" total institutions, possibly can be more easily changed).

Nordstrom, Friedenberg, and Gold (1967), studying several public high schools, found that the institutions and their managers attempted to mold individuals, preferring people who were "inert" to creative persons who might attempt to innovate or challenge the system. Political scientist Marilyn Gittell, in her three-year study of the New York City schools (1967), found a congested bureaucracy in which individuals were constantly jockeying for power at the expense of the children who were entrusted to them.

The problems of power conservation and bureaucratic congestion in prisons are similar to those of any total institution. Such places tend to "swallow" individuals who become a part of them, whether they be inmates or employees. Thus, in a real sense, the prison staff and the inmate population are victimized by the total institution. Employees are entangled in a vast system of authoritarian and bureaucratic guidelines, loopholes, and knots which allow little or no flexibility. Institutions seem particularly prone to preserving the status quo, despite the efforts of individuals to change them, as any impatient reformer knows all too well.

The institutional rules, regulations, and "presence" are fortified by an intensive fear which frequently immobilizes the staff and makes change impossible—*a fear that any change will bring chaos. For most of the* employees in staff positions, any obvious disruption of the prison's security function (for example, riots or escapes) could easily result in the loss of their jobs and the ruination of their careers; for some it could mean their lives.

Many meaningless regulations and routines of institutional life are perpetuated by the anxiety of prison officials concerning the control of their unwilling captives. Order and repression, it is reasoned, are the only sensible ways to handle these "dangerous" individuals. Thus, regulations cover everything from obviously dangerous activities, such as acquiring sharp objects, to such innocuous concerns as personal dress and hair styles. Regulations are enforced rigidly without value judgments as to rationality and necessity. Ironically, in most long-standing institutions the original utility of and rationale for specific rules and regulations have long since disappeared, leaving innumerable bureaucratically ensnared formalities which further encumber the lives of prisoners and feed the fears of the staff (Cressey, 1968; McCleery, 1960; Sykes, 1958).

The bureaucratic nature of prisons, with its regimentation and routinization, can generate authoritarianism, especially among those in ritualized, impersonal jobs. McCleery (1968) found that routines become symbolic rituals which lead to authoritarianism and that authoritarianism tends to increase as the employee is further removed from the mainstream of communications.

Glaser (1964) has described significant differences in the nature of inmate-staff relations depending upon the kind of job and work setting of the prison employee. He found that work supervisors were generally well liked by prisoners while guards were generally disliked. He concluded:

> The more comprehensive and nonritualized the duties of employee with inmates, the more he tends to treat them as individuals and on the basis of personal attributes rather than as a class or a status group, and this is reciprocated by the inmates.
>
> The more ritualistic and routinized the duties, the more the employee is inclined to become authoritarian and punitive, regardless of official policies and directives, and the more he rationalizes this behavior by negative stereotyping of inmates: this too is reciprocated (pp. 138–139).

Maintaining the Distance between Keepers and Kept. The staff members of a prison are faced with a basic conflict in their relationships with prisoners. Those who must interact on a daily basis with inmates attempt to maintain a status differentiation in order to enforce their authority and remain detached. Yet, at the same time they must develop inmate cooperation and a minimal amount of acceptance and favor to keep order. As a result, they are constantly forced to alternate between distance and familiarity. The problem is compounded by the fact that guards and work supervisors are human beings and, as such, may become personally involved with specific inmates, either positively or negatively. Generally, total institutions formalize this distance.

In his study of a mental hospital, Goffman (1961) observed one of the fundamental characteristics of total institutions:

> . . . a basic split between a large managed group, conveniently called inmates, and a small supervisory staff. . . . Each grouping tends to conceive of the other in terms of narrow hostile stereotypes, staff often seeing inmates as bitter, secretive, and untrustworthy, while inmates often see staff as condescending, high-handed, and mean. Staff tends to feel superior and righteous; inmates tend, in some ways at least, to feel inferior, weak, blameworthy, and guilty. Social mobility between the two strata is grossly restricted; social distance is typically great and often formally prescribed. Even talk across the boundaries may be conducted in a special tone of voice (pp. 7–8).

For the staff member of a custodial prison, however, the dilemma of maintaining a distance from the inmates is complicated by the fact that his authority is based upon rank rather than competence. Cressey (1965) distinguishes between these two kinds of authority. Authority based on position or rank (where subordinates obey and do not make value judgments about orders because it would be painful to do so) emphasizes obedience and discipline; in the case of "expert" authority, the subordinate believes in and defers to technical authority on the basis of competence. While all organizations have an intermingling of both types, the punitive custodial prison is an excellent example of the rank or bureaucratic kind of authority. Since the authority of the staff is not based upon some sort of competence which is accepted by the inmates, the staff must enforce its legitimacy with force and regimentation. (The ideal treatment prison would have the "expert" type of technical authority and therefore would have no problem in gaining the acceptance and compliance of inmates, who would be seen as "patients.")

Aside from this lack of unquestionable competence, and thus authority, the prison guard faces several other dilemmas because he is intimately associated with the inmate for forty hours of each week. He cannot withdraw physically, and no intermediaries can bear the brunt of frustrations over rules and regulations (Sykes, 1966). His relationship with the inmates determines whether he is respected, ridiculed, hated, or feared. Sykes observes that the guard may even identify with the inmates, either because he admires a wealthy and influential prisoner or because he shares the plight of the convict in being the victim of the distant administration which neither explains orders nor permits deviations by staff or inmates. Because of the explosive potential of the custodial prison, the administration feels compelled to demand absolute compliance to the most petty regulations. Since the prison guard and the inmate alike face repercussions for small infractions, the staff member may share a common resentment and mutual sympathy with prisoners.

As a result of his precarious position, and perhaps as a defense against dissolving the barriers between the keeper and the kept, the guard frequently develops a disparaging attitude toward the inmates, whom he perceives and treats as animals, perverts, and immoral scoundrels. This problem is compounded in the case of white guards and black inmates, as indicated in the section concerning racism in prisons. The black prisoner may face additional disparagement and prejudice because of his skin color, making an already intolerable situation even worse.

Conflicting Views of Criminals and Treatment. The rehabilitation of prisoners is further complicated by the coexistence of conflicting philosophies about the purposes of prisons and the nature of prisoners, together with attitudes and approaches which stem from the historic development of corrections and the practical problems of prison control. The prison traditionally has been a place where offenders are locked up to segregate them from society. The public still views the custodial and security aspect of a prison as one of its major functions. Prison has also been seen as a place where one must "pay his debt to society," where one receives just and fair punishment for his transgressions.

The concept of rehabilitation through treatment has become more common during the twentieth century. This approach, however, has been superimposed upon the existing security-custody operation and thus is constantly compromised, for the goals of the two types of organizations are frequently antagonistic.

Cressey's extensive analyses of prison organization (1954, 1960, 1961, 1965, 1968) indicate that prisons function on the basis of three separate yet simultaneous systems: a military system, an industrial system, and a service system. Nearly all modern penal facilities have three principal administrative hierarchies, relatively independent of each other, which are devoted to keeping (custodians), serving (rehabilitative staff), and using (work supervisors) prisoners. Since new services and roles have been added without regard for already existing institutions, there is no relationship, no integration, no chain of command among these three systems. Each has different relationships, patterns of authority, communication channels, and decision-making processes as well as specific structures for distributing rewards and punishments. Thus, there are inherent conflicts among the three systems, and different prison administrations emphasize different systems. Needless to say, in many institutions conflicts frequently arise between the custodial and professional staffs over policy, practice, and control.

In his analysis of different types of prison organization, Cressey (1965) contends that the treatment orientation cannot be superimposed successfully upon the custodial institution because the two approaches demand radically different types of behavior. In an institution which is both treatment- and custody-oriented, employees are in a serious bind: they must use treatment ethics when those in higher positions are treatment specialists, but they also face punishment if they do not maintain minimum control. The relationship between staff and prisoners becomes confused, and both rank and technical authority are neutralized through conflicting treatment and custodial objectives. A pattern of indulgence and inconsistency develops and becomes defined as treatment. What appears to be "treatment" may actually be anything from social work to friendship to unofficial punishments and rewards. The whole meaning of rehabilitation becomes subverted and distorted in the futile attempt to meet all of the conflicting demands of the institution.

Zald (1968) confirms Cressey's observations about the staff stresses in treatment or mixed-goal orientations. He examined the conflict between the professional and lay personnel in five different types of institutions and found that custodial institutions have a lower level of conflict than mixed-goal or treatment-oriented prisons.

After studying a small general prison in Hawaii as it made a transition from custodial to treatment orientation, McCleery (1960) described the difficulties inherent in the change. When the prison was a custodial prototype, the prisoners had no rights, only privileges, and the exercise of power was based essentially on force rather than justice. No alternatives of behavior were presented to the subjects, reform was subverted to custody, and communications centered on constant reassertion of custodial values. Through the control of communications (reports, referrals, requests to see treatment staff), the custodial force adapted the efforts of other institutional units (treatment, industrial) to the support of its own functions. The entire prison could best be characterized as a police state. The custodial hierarchy was modeled on military organization with employees of different rank; the power to command others was a major source of prestige. Communication of information flowed only in an upward direction, while orders traveled down the staff hierarchy. To influence decisions, those at lower levels used the techniques of withholding information.

The "liberal revolution" in the prison studied by McCleery came with the hiring of new administrators, including a warden who maintained an open door policy and insisted on "due process" in the punishment of inmates. This new group, strongly convinced of the natural goodness of man, geared its policies toward ending the suspicion, secrecy, and arbitrary punitiveness which was generated at all levels of the staff. The old guard among the staff members fought the changes bitterly because the treatment orientation, including direct access to high administrators, usurped their power based on punishment and cooperation with inmate leaders. They continued to implement old policies at lower levels despite attempts from the top to change. A new group of recent employees gained speedy access to communications with the liberal administrators and joined in an anti-old guard coalition. As inmates gained access to communication and information, the guards rapidly lost status. The status pyramid of the prison society was flattened, and the gaps of social distance in the hierarchy of authority narrowed. A description of the effects of these changes on the inmate population is included in the following section on inmate culture.

As these studies indicate, the problems inherent in conflicting approaches to corrections make any attempt to effect constructive change difficult and corruptible.

Intersection and Collision between Inmates and Prison Staff

Much has already been said about the confusing interrelationships which evolve in the prison setting. The relationships between inmates and staff members are simultaneously the most precarious and the most necessary of all. The inmate subculture is so closely related to the functioning of the basic power structure of the administrative hierarchy that it mirrors that structure in terms of communications, power allocation, and social characteristics. The dependency of prison life, so terrifyingly like the status of a child in an authoritarian home, frequently leads to the "institutionalization" or "colonization" of inmates. This dependency, together with the frustrations, fears, and rejection of prison life, frequently cause the inmate to hate those who keep him in chains. The prison staff—indeed all people in authority—are considered stupid, callous, and corrupt; the dehumanizing experiences in prison justify these prejudices. Antagonisms between the keepers and the kept, however, are mitigated by the fact that the staff and inmates are mutually dependent: the outnumbered staff must solicit cooperation to keep order, and inmates must depend on staff members for privileges and recommendations. Thus, the cohesive and divisive factors which affect relationships among inmates also affect inmate-staff relationships. In fact, inmate-staff relationships are so vital to the functioning of the entire institution that transfers of privileges, duties, and power take place; a coalition of staff and prisoners is essential to keep order in a security-oriented prison. Consequently, the staff power and authority is corrupted, and powerful inmate leaders emerge who control and exploit their peers. It is evident that the mutual dependence of inmates and staff affects the nature of all relationships within the security-oriented prison.

INMATE CULTURE AS A MIRROR OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE POWER STRUCTURE

Numerous studies have graphically indicated that the nature of the inmate subculture and the relationships of the inmates to each other are strongly influenced by the interrelationships of staff to staff and of staff to prisoners. Indeed, the parallels are so great that the prison subculture can be seen as a mirror image of the staff community. Lewin (1939) discovered this striking relationship between group structure and type of leadership in the 1930s, when he conducted his classic experiments with groups of boys who worked on projects under authoritarian, democratic, or *laissez faire* leadership.

Lewin found that groups with authoritarian leaders developed high frustration levels but reacted in two very different ways—either highly aggressively or extraordinarily nonaggressively and apathetically. The aggressive group exhibited much "ego-involved" behavior, such as demands for attention, criticism and competition, and aggressive acts, including "strikes," scapegoating, and impersonal and substitute hate objects (e.g., destruction of their work). The democratic club members were more spontaneous, fact- and task-oriented, friendly, and proud of their work; they related to the leader on a free and equal basis. All youths preferred both *laissez faire* and democracy to autocracy. Clubs changed markedly when they switched from one type of system to another, but there were sudden outbursts of aggression when boys first moved from autocracy to democracy, indicating intense pent-up frustration.

McCleery, Street, and Glaser have discovered similar relationships in their studies of prisons. Street (1963), through interview and observation, studied the inmates and staffs of four institutions whose orientations varied from custodial to treatment. He found that variations in organizational goals (attitudes, policy, and practice) give rise to differences in inmate orientations and group characteristics. The custodial institutions had more "order" but also faced a "solidarity opposition" from the authoritarian inmate structure. The treatment prisons were more oriented to changes in the inmates, and prisoners developed positive relationships with the institution.

McCleery's study (1960) of the transition of a small general prison from an authoritarian to a treatment orientation indicates graphically how closely inmate relations mirror staff relations. He found that the power structure of the administration greatly influenced the inmate social system and that changes in the lines of communication in one resulted in similar changes in the other. The inmates in the custodial situation lived in a strict hierarchy of power similar to that of the staff, with an emphasis on conformity (where rebellion might have been expected). Coercive power held the highest value in the subculture; to achieve independence from official pressures and sanctions, the powerful inmates enforced conformity by more severe sanctions than the officials would ever utilize. New inmates were helpless and had to kowtow to be "in," to make life bearable. The powerful prisoners were a group of skilled manipulators who maintained the myths of the "devil theory" ("rats are lurking in every corner," "everyone's out to get us") as a means of control. The staff cooperated with inmate leaders to keep things running smoothly.

As the prison became treatment-oriented, a transition of power occurred within the inmate social system which was very similar to the struggle among the staff. The old prison society was static and stratified, with "old cons" in the role of elders. Thus, the old cons had as much to lose as the old guard staff members and united with them in an attempt to undercut the liberal revolution. Old cons tried to arrest the changes, refusing to cooperate with the new inmate council because their status in the council meant nothing compared to their previous control.

The monolithic structure of inmate society began to crack as first offenders, who were previously the lowest caste, found a focus of interest and organization. Two new inmate groups emerged: first offenders who were treatment-oriented and aggressive young toughs who rejected guidance of any kind. (The toughs were eventually transferred to another prison.) The "rat" concept disappeared as more and more inmates cooperated with officials for treatment. With the breakdown of the old cons' authority, the young toughs terrorized the prison. Violence and disorder followed the collapse of customary patterns of communication, but the definition of new relationships and roles fostered a return to stability. One great stabilizer was the warden's willingness to meet with key inmates to explain problems and situations. This eliminated the mystery and secrecy which generated inmate fear and superstition. Voluntary participation increased, and the number of disciplinary problems declined. Most inmates began to participate in the programs, and a coalition of first offenders and the more conservative inmates was formed against the toughs and old cons. The entire process of transition lasted approximately eight years.

Glaser (1964) found a similar relationship between staff and inmate social structure. He concludes that researchers were mistaken to assume that inmate isolation from officials was due to the solidarity of the inmate subculture. Rather, he claims, the attitude and behavior of the staff toward inmates is the independent variable. Because staff and inmate relationships mirror each other, the degree of isolation of inmates from one another varies directly with their isolation from officials.

Total Dependency: A Terrifying Return to Childhood. Despite the powerful inmate subculture, prisoners are hopelessly dependent upon their captors and upon the encaging monolith for the necessities of life and for any small favors which might make their dull, grinding existence more bearable. Both Sykes (1958) and Menninger (1966) maintain that the prison milieu forces every inmate into psychological as well as physical dependence. Orders and rules which seem illogical and harassing come from above without explanation or excuse. Menninger (1966) and Goffman (1961) observe that this situation parallels that of the small child in an authoritarian home, and for many prisoners it is, in a real sense, a return to the status of a child. Such a situation is profoundly threatening to the self-image of any man because it abolishes his independent adult status and reduces him to the "weak, helpless, dependent status of childhood." It is nearly impossible, under such circumstances, to maintain one's sense of adult competence, maturity, and self-determination.

Inmates of total institutions react to this complete dependency and loss of contact with the outer world in many ways. Many become "overcolonized" (Goffman, 1961) or institutionalized (Shiloh, 1968) and thus find the prison a refuge, a safe solution to their problems. Others suffer greatly, depending on the defenses they can muster to protect themselves (Farber, 1944).

Anthropologist Ailon Shiloh (1968) confirms Goffman's observations about the "colonization" of inmates of total institutions in his study of a Veterans Administration hospital. Shiloh found two major categories of patients: 40 percent were institutionalized (they did not want to leave), and 25 percent were noninstitutionalized and hoped to be released soon. The rest were somewhere in between these two extremes. During interviews, the institutionalized individuals were passive, silent, rambling, apathetic, noncooperative, and fearful; the noninstitutionalized were articulate, interested, coherent, and straightforward. The institutionalized patients saw the mental hospital as the "best solution" to their problems; for them it was an "old soldiers' home," far better than skid row or their other life alternatives. It was a comfortable place (with television, recreation, and so forth) which satisfied their needs. They made a point of staying out of trouble so they would not lose their privileges, were totally noncritical of the institution, and had no outside contacts. Many were there because they did not want to leave rather than because they were mentally ill. In contrast, the noninstitutionalized individuals had close outside relationships and saw their hospitalization as a temporary, unfortunate occurrence. They were critical of the institution and its therapy program, but at the same time they attempted to be as inconspicuous as possible, lest they draw unfavorable attention and negative sanctions.

Of course, prisons differ from mental hospitals, but there is a certain definite overlap of populations, and the general characteristics of total institutions apply to both. Institutionalization in prisons may take a somewhat different form, but it doubtlessly exists.

During the last few decades, psychologists and criminologists have found that inmates, especially "lifers," lose the urge to adapt to the outside world and become extremely egocentric. Three kinds of behavior that result from a long prison sentence are self-deception, self-resignation, and a retreat to fantasy.

Suffering is prominent in any total institution. Farber (1944) studied the suffering and escape orientation of forty inmates at the Iowa State Penitentiary and found six factors related to the degree of suffering. Those which increased suffering included the belief that the sentence was unjust, the belief that the time served was unjust, an indefinite time of release, and the unfriendliness of the outside world. Factors negatively correlated with suffering included the hope of getting "a break" and involvement in recreation, social life, and cell block activities.

The first three factors accounted for 58 percent of the suffering. Farber found a definite "calculus of punishment" in the mind of the prisoner in which he balances the amount of time served with his sense of guilt and his sense of debt.

Hatred of the Keepers. Psychologists agree that the self-concept of any man is formed and reshaped by the attitudes of significant others toward him; negative responses from others can be extremely threatening. Sykes (1958) and McCorkle and Korn (1954) point out that the harsh, brutal reality of societal rejection force the inmate to seek self-affirmation among fellow prisoners and to defend his sense of worth by rejecting the society which is chastizing him.

The state has endowed the prison guard, as its representative, with almost unlimited powers over the inmates and their rights. Thus, the prisoner focuses his ill feelings and hostilities upon his custodians, who are natural objects for all the anger and hatred he feels toward the larger society. The prison code itself generates and feeds attitudes which are charged with hate—the hate of those who have failed and have had their failure rubbed in by the more powerful (Clemmer, 1940).

Barnes (1965) characterizes the relationship between inmates and the prison staff as a "cold war" which sometimes warms into violence. The one common bond among inmates is that they are on the wrong side of the "rod and bolt curtain" (prison bars).

To discredit their keepers, prisoners have a dogma which defines those on the other side of the bars as stupid, callous, and corrupt (Clemmer, 1940). The prisoner privately refers to staff members by derogatory names and circumvents authority as much as possible. The ethics of the prison culture dictate that he avoid communication with "screws," speak only when spoken to, and show his contempt of them by cooperating in only the most superficial ways. Generally, the gulf between custodian and captive cannot be bridged. Prison lore and culture glorify the defiant and the treacherous, the strong and clever, and abhor the man who tries to make contacts with those on the other side of the fence. Prison ballads, doggerel, and tales praise the courageous antiadministration and antisocial acts of singular men—the great escape, the clever one-upmanship, the daring defiance.

The prison guard, the cop, the politician, the white collar worker, the business executive, and all "respectable" citizens are seen as squabbling over their share of the juicy American pie, furtively sneaking off with the biggest piece of the take that they can embezzle, pilfer, plunder, blackmail, swindle, defraud, or swipe. The conviction that all those on the other side of the bars are corrupt is frequently well founded in the experiences of prison life. The larger society has condemned the criminal for violence or theft, yet the prison official—the societal surrogate—may resort to violent aggression against inmates and may take or destroy their prized possessions. The privileged class of captors can violate most of the human rights of the captives, but the captives dare not deviate for fear of chastizement. In a world where the "correctors" can violate many of the laws for which the "to be corrected" have been institutionalized, it is understandable that prisoners become cynical and view the world as corrupt. The repression in custodial prisons increases the seething, silent, ever-increasing pressure of inmate rage, causing officials to react even more oppressively. It is a vicious cycle of hate and repression which must eventually explode into violence.

As Menninger (1966) sees it, the wonder is that there are so few riots, for "the maximum-security policy advocated by the old-time penologists has the effect of increasing frantic, desperate, and furious reactions" (p. 78).

The strength of the inmates' feelings in these circumstances is expressed in the convict's terms by Eldridge Cleaver (1968), who believes that he could have gotten an earlier release from prison but would have been "less of a man" if he had followed the path laid by officials. He comments:

> A convict's paranoia is as thick as the prison wall—and just as necessary. Why should we have faith in anyone? Even our wives and lovers . . . leave us after a while. . . . All society shows the convict its ass and expects him to kiss it: the convict feels like kicking it or putting a bullet in it (p. 20).

Corruption of Authority: The Subverting Coalition. The potential explosiveness of the antagonism between prisoner and staff is mitigated by the interdependence of the two groups. This interdependence leads to the corruption of authority in the prison, which provides the inmates with a channel to privilege and self-assertion. By rewarding inmates for cohesive and conservative actions, the staff ensures order; by cooperating in this game, the convict gains a relaxation of restrictions and prohibitions. This coalition of cooperative inmates and staff keeps things "cool" within the prison walls.

The prison guard is under tremendous pressure to compromise with the inmates in many areas of life—letting infractions pass "unnoticed," allowing the inmate leaders to flagrantly violate rules without repercussions. He must inevitably cope with the basic facts of prison life: he must be able to control his charges to keep his job; yet he and his comrades are greatly outnumbered. In case of trouble (such as riots), his life may depend on the good will of those he presently controls. Thus, the guard must muster the cooperation of the prisoners, and to do this, he must yield to them by overlooking minor infractions—food in the cells, an occasional brawl, contraband, homosexual activity. By doing so, he may be assured of "order" and thus of his job and his physical well being. If he does not play the game, he may face many uncomfortable and threatening situations (Sykes, 1958).

When the prison demands production of goods from the inmates, when the economy and rationale of the institution require that the inmates "earn their keep," work supervisors must also bribe the convicts. When Sykes (1958) studied the New Jersey State Prison at Trenton, he found that although the prison needed the "labor of [its] captives," the captives did not need it themselves. Thus, even though the inmates had no motivation to work hard, the custodians' jobs were jeopardized if production was not adequate. Since the staff was prohibited from using effective rewards and punishments, it was under great pressure to utilize illegal rewards.

In most prisons even the administration is far more concerned with the end product of order than with the means of achieving it; therefore, life can be very uncomfortable for a guard who will not play the game. As Sykes (1966) points out, the prison administration realizes that its apparent dominance rests upon some degree of voluntary cooperation. The employee who uses too much punishment is in trouble. The guard must walk a tightrope between the concessions he must make to keep order and those that inmates will draw from him if he is weakwilled, lazy, or easily intimidated. Sykes indicates that custodial jobs and authority may fall to inmates through laxness or nonfeasance, rather than malfeasance, corrupting the relationship and making it virtually impossible for the custodian to regain control. Some guards inevitably begin relegating their own responsibilities to inmates—e.g., the body count, weapons check, messages, errands—giving tremendous power to those who are chosen. The guard who is careless may discover that his power has subtly and slowly slipped away, leaving him with an empty job. Yet, if he attempts to reassert himself, the inmates will threaten to inform the administration of his past indiscretions.

Thus emerge the powerful inmate leaders who manipulate both inmates and guards to their own aggrandizement and are a major source of stability in the seething, repressed inmate community. Cloward (1960) has found that these inmate politicians or "big shots" have almost exclusive contact with the prison staff, limiting the contact of others by means of inmate pressure and the "bogey man" myth of the "rat." Any less powerful inmate who attempts to reach the staff is immediately the object of suspicion and reprisals. Basically, Cloward points out, the big shots have a stake in the status quo, and the "conservative ideology of the inmate elite" evolves.

Circumvention and defiance are the inevitable results of total dependency on the institution and its staff, deprivation of material goods and leisure pursuits, and the hostility generated by rejection and debasement. The inmates of any custodial prison direct vast energies toward undermining the regimented and restricted life of the institution. An intricate system of contraband supplies inmates, at greatly exaggerated costs, with many of the material goods and luxuries which are denied in prison. Cigarettes, candy, books, pornography, coffee, homemade liquor, and even drugs can usually be purchased on the black market. Bribery and extortion are components of everyday life. In his study of a prison that held the worst offenders in the state of New Jersey, Sykes (1958) found that regardless of the personalities of the prisoners, prison life itself creates strong pressures toward "criminal" behavior.

The contention that prisons serve as places where men learn to become law-abiding citizens seems ridiculous in view of the corruption of authority in prisons. If anything, many prisoners seem to corrupt the prison, rather than be reformed by it.

SUMMARY

This chapter draws together many studies of prison life in an attempt to document the ways in which the basic structure of a prison is inherently antithetical to rehabilitation. It is generally believed that the goal of imprisonment is to release an individual who is capable of assuming a productive role in society. When the characteristics of a prison are examined, however, many elements seem to act in opposition to this goal. It can even be argued that the prison experience may make one less able to live within normal legal restraints.

The most obvious fact of life in the prison is complete isolation from normal social contacts. Within the correctional institution, a different, largely pernicious system of roles and relationships develops. Operating simultaneously within this system are conflicts between inmates and staff members, "pecking orders" among the inmates, racism, subversion of authority, and the psychological changes brought about by fear, dependency, and frustration. In those prisons which make an honest attempt at rehabilitation, further confusion results from attempting to reconcile conflicting objectives.

Given the problems discussed here, there should be little wonder that prisons are often unsuccessful in rehabilitating criminals. In most custodial institutions, the normal supports are removed from an inmate, and few healthy alternatives are provided. Personal growth requires the freedom to make choices and to accept the consequences of these choices, but the total dependency of prison existence removes this freedom and replaces it with a stark and hostile environment in which the individual is forced to spend most of his energy protecting himself both physically and psychologically.

PART II A CASE STUDY

4

AN EXPERIMENTAL HUMANITIES PROGRAM: THE SETTING AND THE INMATES

A brief review of the literature on prison life reveals that many antirehabilitative elements are present in the correctional institution. One is tempted to ask, as a result of the bleak picture which was painted in the previous chapter, whether rehabilitation is indeed a realistic goal within the context of such deprivation and authoritarian control.

This report is concerned with an experiment which, in a very broad sense, attempted to shed some light on that question. More specifically, the experiment was an attempt to evaluate the effects of an experimental humanities program on the attitudes and behavior of young male offenders. It was hoped that the study of the humanities might lead the inmates to reconsider their values and help them in their search for a sense of personal identity.

The idea of a humanities program in the prison may seem incongruous, or even ludicrous, to many. While the humanities are considered among the highest and most ennobling of man's creations, prisons suggest the extreme opposite. Society tries to hide, forget, and ignore its prisons, but they remain a constant, nagging reminder of the baser nature of man—of the selfishness and cruelty inherent in all men.

Because the humanities and prisons are apparently so incompatible, the humanities have much to offer. The young men who typically end up in prison have rarely been exposed to the humanities; for most of them, school has been nothing but a long succession of frustrating experiences and failures. Reading, studying, and classes are painful reminders of their previous failure. Yet it seems clear that young men who, in their late adolescence, find themselves in prison must be concerned with the meaning of their lives. The humanities appeared to be an excellent vehicle to tap this concern and to introduce the students to materials which would lead them to examine their lives.

To accomplish this overall objective, several different approaches were devised and implemented; they were abandoned when they proved unworkable. Finally, an approach was arrived at which could simultaneously encompass the objectives of the program, the interests of the students, and the security considerations of the prison.

THE SETTING

The experiment described in this report was conducted at the State Correctional Institution at Camp Hill, Pennsylvania, an institution which incarcerates young men fifteen to twenty-one years of age. The huge doors, gates, and locks of Camp Hill make the strongest and most lasting impression on a new visitor. Defined in terms of an adult prison, Camp Hill is a minimum security institution. It is, however, a full-fledged prison. The grounds are surrounded by a high cyclone wire fence which is topped with barbed wire. Doors and gates are always kept locked. Chadwick Hansen, curriculum consultant to the project, described the setting as follows:

> Although the physical plant is relatively clean and modern, the initial impression made on most outsiders is one of massive indignity and potential brutality. Inmates live in cellblocks. These are also relatively clean, well lighted, and reasonably well ventilated. Yet they deny the inmate the smallest degree of privacy. The net impression is that of caged people in a human zoo—including the smells of the zoo, in spite of ventilation. The grounds between the buildings are spacious. But outside as well as inside, the atmosphere of the prison is always present. The fence is always visible. So are the guard towers, with their armed guards and searchlights. Nobody ever steps off the paths onto the grass, because to do so would suggest irregularity and alarm the guards.

According to its official state designation, Camp Hill is the institution for minor (under twenty-one years of age) offenders convicted of the types of crimes usually committed by adults. It is the "end of the line" for juvenile offenders; almost all of the inmates were committed to Camp Hill when they could not adjust in other institutions or community placements. Most of those incarcerated at Camp Hill are not simple delinquents or incorrigibles; their most common offenses are crimes against property, but inmates convicted of assault, rape, and murder are also present.

Because it serves young offenders, the Camp Hill Institution makes more of an effort to rehabilitate its inmates than any other prison in the state system. All new arrivals receive diagnostic appraisals which guide the Institution in its attempt to provide beneficial educational and work experiences. The educational program extends from basic literacy instruction through college courses, and inmates who are under sixteen years of age must attend school. Those who are over sixteen but have not completed high school attend classes to prepare for a test which yields a high school equivalency diploma. College courses are offered by the Harrisburg Area Community College to students with the necessary qualifications.

In addition to these academic classes, the prison's education building has a wide variety of shops, and instruction is given in over twenty vocational skills. Formal instruction is combined with work experiences in the various agricultural, industrial, construction, service, and maintenance operations conducted by the Institution.

The medical and psychological services are also, by normal prison standards, extensive. Medical care includes corrective and cosmetic surgery as well as the provision of prosthetic devices. Each inmate is assigned to a caseworker who has access to full-time psychiatrists and psychologists.

Despite the emphasis on rehabilitation, Camp Hill is primarily organized for detention and control. Its inmates are not there of their own choosing, and some are, at times, incapable of controlling themselves. There is a constant threat that some of the inmates may endanger other inmates or members of the staff. The pervading atmosphere is reflected in a continuous concern for control and security. The underlying philosophy is that the potential for dangerous incidents is reduced if officers are constantly in charge of and responsible for the inmates.

The concern over security influences every procedure in the Institution. Any proposed activity is evaluated first in terms of its effects upon control and second in terms of its objective. This emphasis on control must be appreciated in order to understand the evolution of the experimental humanities program, but any attempt to underscore such a condition is feeble compared to the pervasive atmosphere of control which a visitor encounters when he enters the gates. If this atmosphere is so evident to visitors who know they can leave at any time, how much stronger it must seem to inmates.

The emphasis on control is not described here to criticize the prison, but rather to portray the environment within which the humanities program operated. Prison officials readily admitted that security was a major consideration in all of their activities and further contended that the Institution could not operate without it. Given the present nature of the Institution, this is probably an accurate statement.

Stemming from the control function is the second major variable that influences all activities in the prison—namely, the continuous latent conflict between inmates and staff. Rarely does this conflict become overt, but it influences all interactions between the two groups. Staff members are constantly in the position of forcing inmates to do things against their will. Obviously, the first task of the staff is to keep the inmates in the Institution until parole or release. Once this is achieved, the staff must make the inmates get up in the morning, clean their cells, go to breakfast, go to jobs and school, and so on throughout the day. The inmates generally believe that none of this coercion is fair. Few feel much guilt about their crimes—they tend to think that their real mistake was getting caught. In the minds of many inmates, the actions of the prison staff serve as direct and tangible evidence of a society that they believe has always treated them unfairly.

The penalties for direct disobedience are severe enough, however, that few inmates risk it. They comply rather than cooperate with officials and constantly test the minimum level of compliance that will avoid punishment. The staff, therefore, must continuously prompt and warn the inmates to behave in prescribed ways. Thus, the constant negative interaction between staff and inmates both results from the conflict between them and serves to perpetuate this conflict.

The third major variable that determines the institutional atmosphere at Camp Hill is racial conflict. There are approximately equal numbers of black and white inmates at the Institution, and racial antagonism is the major divisive force between them. The inmates, who come mainly from the lower socioeconomic strata, have led lives of repeated deprivation and failure. They have been denied most of the material things which are highly valued in our society and have failed time after time at educational and vocational tasks. They have even failed at crime, for they have been caught and caged. The natural results of such lives are profound hostility and resentment as well as basic, though largely repressed, fears about one's competence as a human being.

Hatred of the opposite race is an effective way of dealing with these deep hostilities and fears about oneself. The hatred which is directed towards the other race provides an "acceptable" outlet for aggression. At the same time, the approval and acceptance which one receives from others who share his antipathy compensate for personal inadequacies and provide the satisfaction of identification with a "superior" group.

Most expressions of racial hatred in the prison were symbolic, such as swastikas carved into desk tops or slogans written inside textbook covers. Four months before the inception of the humanities program, however, a full-fledged racial battle took place on the athletic field, and a few weeks after the program started, several blacks attacked three guards, nearly killing one. The Institution was justifiably concerned about the racial issue but, like society in general, was unsure of how to handle it. The major policy was to try to avoid any situation that might touch off other incidents.

These three forces acting in the environment at Camp Hill—the emphasis on security and control, the conflict between staff and inmates, and the racial antagonism—all had major impact upon the evolution of the humanities program.

THE INMATES

Approximately 900 men, with an average age of 18.5 years, are incarcerated at Camp Hill. Most of them have committed serious crimes or have been involved repeatedly with the law. They are not unintelligent; even when measured by standard IQ tests, which are biased toward middle-class whites, the average IQ is almost 100, and two-thirds of the inmates are in the normal 90 to 110 range. Despite their ability, however, they have had considerable difficulty in school. The average number of grades completed is only six, and test equivalent grade performance is at the same level.

The inmates who were selected to participate in the humanities program had somewhat better academic skills than the average inmate. The Camp Hill Institution conducts both day and evening educational programs at every level from basic literacy training to college courses. The humanities subjects were selected from students enrolled in the evening diploma program which prepares its students to take the General Equivalency Diploma (GED) test; passing the GED test indicates that an individual has an education equal to that of an average high school graduate. The inmates assigned to this program have demonstrated that they can handle academic material at the secondary school level. Because the humanities program planned to emphasize reading and creative writing, the GED program seemed to be the most appropriate source for experimental subjects.

SELECTING THE SUBJECTS

To evaluate the results of the humanities project, it was necessary to collect data on inmates who were similar to the humanities students but who did not participate in the program. To achieve this comparability, certain characteristics of all inmates assigned to the GED program were examined before the classes began. Race, age, and IQ were used as the main matching variables, with secondary consideration given to criminal history and scholastic achievement. Inmates who had recorded histories of narcotics addiction, diagnosed psychiatric abnormalities, or overt physical handicaps were eliminated from the matching process. In addition, inmates whose sentences extended more than eight months after the end of the humanities program were excluded so that it would be possible to follow up the post-release experiences of the subjects.

Since it was not possible to match the subjects exactly on the selected variables, the inmates were grouped into categories by race (black and white), age (over and under eighteen years), and IQ (below 90, 90 to 105, and over 105). The dividing points for the age and IQ variables were selected to yield groups of nearly equal size.

Thus, there were twelve groups of subjects with similar characteristics (two race × two age × three IQ). Within each of these groups, the most similar subjects were paired. One of each pair was then randomly assigned to the humanities program and the other to the GED control group. Extra subjects were assigned to each group, and the groups were balanced on the secondary criteria by withdrawing subjects in pairs until the best possible group match was achieved. To provide another control group, students in the Institution's vocational program were classified into the same categories used with the GED students, and those with the best match were selected as subjects.

It is very likely that if the humanities program had been offered on a voluntary basis, its students would have been more interested and receptive than the subjects who were actually chosen. Using volunteers, however, would have yielded a group that was in some way different from nonvolunteers. In addition, the inmates at Camp Hill are not normally given any choice as to the courses they will study. Thus, assignment to the humanities program was similar to other course assignments at the Institution.

The matching procedure resulted in the formation of three groups of subjects, each containing fifty-nine inmates. An exact match was accomplished for race, with each group having eighteen black and forty-one white inmates. Statistical analysis demonstrated that the small between-group differences in types of crimes committed and legal classification (criminal court or juvenile court sentence) were nonsignificant; the majority of subjects in each group were juvenile cases sentenced for repeated property offenses.

No statistically significant between-group differences (excluding subjects for whom pretest scores were unavailable) were found for IQ, arithmetic achievement, or spelling achievement. The vocational control group, however, tended to be slightly older and to have completed more schooling than the other two groups, while the humanities students tended to have a higher level of reading ability. In the analysis of pre and posttest results, scores were statistically manipulated to control for these differences.

Characteristics of the Subjects

This description of the characteristics of the subjects was drawn from interviews conducted at the conclusion of the humanities program.

Eighty-eight (50 percent) of the 117 selected subjects were interviewed, but the results may not be representative of the total inmate population. For example, there were fewer blacks in the classes from which subjects were drawn than in the Institution as a whole. Also, the academic performance of the subjects was higher than the prison average.

These differences suggest that the selected subjects came from slightly more favorable family backgrounds than the typical inmate; in fact, only 10 percent of the subjects reported that their families received welfare assistance. Nevertheless, there was considerable disruption of the families. In half of the families, both parents lived together; in one-third, the parents were divorced or separated; and in the remainder, one or both of the parents was deceased.

During the course of the interviews, responses concerning family relationships amply verified the Gluecks' (1968) finding that delinquent boys were much less likely to have a close relationship with their fathers. When asked which member of his family the subject felt closest to, less than 10 percent replied that it was their father. Slightly less than half reported their mother, and one-third named a brother or sister. The responses to the opposite question—the family member the subject feels farthest from—indicated that about one-third felt farthest from their father. Questions on whom the subjects would turn to for advice on a big decision, on the most important person in their lives, and on the person who has influenced them most on educational and occupational decisions all show very little reliance on fathers. Only on the question of advice did as many as 10 percent of the subjects say they would turn to their fathers.

It is obvious from these data that very few of the subjects related well to their fathers. It seems very likely that failure in this initial relationship with an authority figure made subsequent interaction with authority figures difficult. The general inability of the inmates to relate in a positive manner to authority figures appears to have influenced the decision of the humanities teachers to identify with the inmates rather than with the staff while teaching at Camp Hill.

There were few consistent differences among the three main groups of subjects with regard to their family relationships. On questions concerning values and general orientation toward life, however, something of a pattern emerged: vocational students tended to give answers that might be expected from achievement-oriented, upwardly mobile young men from the lower middle class, while humanities students were slightly more likely to give answers that seemed natural for a young prison inmate. The GED students tended to fall somewhere between the other two groups but were usually closer to the vocational students. The answers of all groups, including the humanities students, were rather middle-class in tone. When asked how they would spend $500 if some one gave it to them tomorrow, one-third of the vocational students, as compared to two-thirds of the humanities students, said they would use it for personal pleasure. Another question that revealed this pattern asked how much control the subjects believed they had over their futures. Nine out of ten of the vocational students thought they had much or very much control, while only half of the humanities students were equally confident. The vocational students tended to define a successful person in terms of achievement, whereas the humanities students were more likely to consider money and possessions as the criteria for success.

Other questions on general outlook did not differentiate between the vocational and humanities groups. When asked whether hard work and planning pay off, about 85 percent of both groups replied affirmatively. One-third of each group thought they were "always" or "often" getting a "dirty deal" from life. Approximately 80 percent of both groups thought a person should try to get a "good" job, "good" being defined as better than his father's. Both the humanities and vocational groups had similar ideas about the most important things in life: slightly over a third of each group thought personal pleasure (happiness) was most important, a little less than a third said family and friends, and about 20 percent cited achievements (getting ahead).

Since all of the interviews were conducted at the end of the program, it is not possible to evaluate changes in interview responses as a result of the program. Nevertheless, the differences between the humanities and vocational students may have been due to the program. On most questions the subjects tended to give answers which indicated an unquestioning acceptance of the predominant values in American society; however, on a few questions the humanities students were more likely to give answers which suggest a more realistic and socially perceptive assessment of their situation in life. While this pattern was not consistent enough to be cited as clear evidence of the effects of the program, it is suggestive and tends to confirm some similar test results.

Despite some evidence that traditional values were being questioned, the fact remains that most of the inmates seemed to accept these values. Merton (1949), as mentioned previously, has provided one explanation for this phenomenon in his analysis of anomie. He contends that the goals of achievement and material possessions are equally distributed throughout all levels of society, but access to these goals is differentially distributed. In the lower classes limited access to these goals through socially approved means can lead to illegal behavior.

SUMMARY

Although the idea of a humanities program in the prison may seem incongruous, the humanities appeared to offer considerable potential for exposing inmates to questions and issues they had never previously considered. To realize this potential, an experimental educational program in the humanities was organized and presented in a prison for young male offenders.

The State Correctional Institution at Camp Hill, Pennsylvania, makes a major effort at rehabilitation, but it is still very much a prison. As such, it places heavy emphasis on security and control, and there is a sharp division between the roles of inmate and staff member. For rather obvious reasons, there is considerable racial antagonism between black and white inmates.

The inmates who participated in the humanities program were selected from the evening school program at Camp Hill, and all were capable of academic work at the secondary school level. The matching procedure which was used in the experiment resulted in the assignment of similar inmates to the humanities program and the two comparison groups. Although many of the inmates came from broken families and few revealed any closeness to their fathers, they tended to accept middle-class values.

5

THE PROGRAM AND ITS PROBLEMS

None of the individuals involved in planning the humanities project thought it would be easy to carry out such a program within a prison setting. Nevertheless, the problems they encountered were more numerous and more complex than anticipated. In developing an analysis of these problems, it would have been easy to describe the humanities staff as outside agitators who tried to disrupt the normal operation of the prison. The prison personnel could just as easily have been described as unbending bureaucrats who were concerned only with preserving the status quo. Neither description would be adequate. Instead, both groups were composed of capable, concerned individuals who were operating in response to various considerations and striving to achieve somewhat conflicting objectives. This is the perspective that was sought in attempting to describe and analyze the problems which arose between the humanities staff and the Institution.

THE PROGRAM

The humanities program was designed in accordance with the definition of "humanities" which was presented in the proposal submitted to the National Endowment for the Humanities: "Within the scope of this study 'humanities' will be defined as any materials which will aid the subjects in arriving at a sense of personal identity which encompasses their individual strengths and weaknesses, while providing a sense of meaning in life and a set of values consistent with life in society" (Lewis, 1969).

Working from this definition, several planning sessions were held to prepare for the program. The planning was carried out within the framework of the class schedule that had been worked out with the officials of the Camp Hill Institution. It was agreed that the humanities program would be composed of students selected from the regular evening diploma program, which was scheduled to meet two nights a week for three hours a night. For one hour of each of these nights, the selected students were to go to the humanities classes instead of regular classes. In addition, on one night of each week there would be a three-hour meeting for which attendance was to be voluntary. The classes were scheduled to meet from September 1968 through April 1969.

A major contribution to the planning occurred during a one-day conference held at The Pennsylvania State University. Educators, psychologists, and correctional specialists, including representatives of the Camp Hill Institution, attended. The conference was quite productive, and a number of useful suggestions were made. Two recurring themes in the conference, however, on which there was general consensus, proved to be almost totally erroneous: first, the need for an overall structure for the program and second, the emphasis on class dialogue and discussion as the main instructional technique. Chadwick Hansen, resource consultant to the project, described the structure which was proposed for the course:

> We agreed on a thematic structure for the course, organized in seven parts. We intended to begin with a consideration of walls—both literal walls, as in the prison itself, and metaphoric ones—including both their negative aspects (e.g., in limiting freedom) and their positive ones (e.g., giving meaningful shape to different kinds of experience). The second topic was to be the isolated individual. Again (and throughout the course) we were to consider both positive and negative aspects of the topic. Topics three through six were to deal with the individual as related to various other entities: the individual and the family; the individual and the functioning *ad hoc* group; the individual and institutions; the individual and his total environment. Finally, topic seven was the self-actualizing individual.
>
> Each of these topics was to be approached not in the abstract but through materials from the arts which would evoke discussion of the issues. We intended to use film (as the art which we thought these students would find most natural); short stories (on the grounds that novels required too long an attention span and that the students would be unlikely to react well to poetry); and the visual arts. We made tentative selections of materials for all seven topics and relatively complete selections for the first three.

Implicit in the structure of the program was the assumption that the presentation of the materials would provoke discussion among the students. This discussion was intended to lead the students to think about their attitudes and values and to evaluate them in the context of the material being discussed. The first feature length film that was shown, *On the Waterfront*, is a good example of the planned format. The protagonist, played by Marlon Brando, is a young man who comes to question the values which have determined the crucial decisions in his life. These values are heavily influenced by the corrupt waterfront union which dominates the lives of the men who work on the docks. He eventually rejects these values and, at great personal risk, leads a revolt against the union.

The film contained elements which were expected to capture the attention and interest of the students: a subculture which was largely removed from the mores and sanctions of the larger society and a hero, with whom the students could easily identify, who found himself increasingly in conflict with this subculture. In addition, there was considerable action, some violence, and a high level of sustained tension throughout the film.

Using audience reaction as an index, the film did capture the interest of the students. They were quiet, became irritated when the picture jumped because of damaged sprocket holes in the track, and occasionally made empathic responses that were appropriate to the tone of the action taking place.

When the film ended and the students broke up into small discussion groups, however, there seemed to be very little desire to discuss the film. The teachers made several attempts to start a dialogue, but were usually answered with brief one- or two-word responses. The students either could not or would not discuss what the film meant to them personally, or even what it was about.

The first experience, with what was generally considered surefire material, was repeated many times with other films and short stories that had been selected before the inception of the program. Gradually, the teachers became aware that "dialogue" is largely a white, middle-class ideal and that these students were not accustomed to verbal expression of their feelings and values. Thus, the instructors began to seek other ways of reaching the students.

The humanities staff attempted to work with the original structure of the program for about one month. When this approach proved fruitless, the teachers agreed to offer three options, or courses, among which the students would be allowed to choose: art and creative writing, contemporary music, and power relationships in society. These classes lasted for about three calendar months, or two actual months of classes due to Thanksgiving and Christmas vacations. The teachers also experimented with an independent study room for the students who did not wish to attend any of the regular classes. In mid-April 1969 the regular evening school at the Institution ended. The humanities program was allowed to continue on a voluntary basis until the end of May, and twenty-five of the forty-one students in the program volunteered to continue.

David Miller, one of the teachers in the humanities project, summarized well the transition which the program underwent:

> Our espoused goal was to teach the humanities, whatever they may be (everything but the sciences and social sciences?). Programs to teach the humanities are usually surveys based on a lofty philos-

ophy involving such words as "goals," "values," "cultural heritage," "eternal questions" (or verities).

Humanities programs, given our culture's long-standing devotion to them and the indefiniteness of much of what they deal in, invite clichéd thinking and operating. I am increasingly convinced that such courses, calling for a prior interest in "culture" and "human values," can only be useful in the subculture which uses such courses as a badge of identity to include themselves and exclude others.

The program did an about-face. In the beginning we provided and organized series of stimuli keyed to a governing metaphor (" walls," "self and society"). In the end we brought in books, magazines, machines, and lively people, and moved off whatever developed. We began by stockpiling reproductions and slides of great works of art to show to the students; we all ended by making our own films, plays, and songs, seeing how they failed, and trying to do better. The teachers went from trying to do things to and for the students to doing things with them.

PROBLEMS ENCOUNTERED

In a prison, one can choose to identify with either the staff or the inmates. It is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to occupy a middle ground. This polarization proved to be a major problem in the humanities program. The teachers were selected and oriented to be understanding of the characteristics and problems of the inmates. The University staff believed then, and still believes, that only teachers who communicate a sense of concern can reach students who are alienated by education and school-like activities. The teachers viewed the inmates as products of their environments rather than as "bad" people.

Craig Kreider, one of the teachers, described a feeling of anticipation that was common among the teachers:

> When I was first approached by one of the teachers concerning the possibilities of my involvement in the project, I was awed, not so much at the enormous task ahead, but more at the prospect of being able to help. It is my contention that as soon as you understand that a person needs help, and respond to that need, he usually responds to you. If I can get the kids to understand that society is not always trying to kick them in the teeth, then perhaps they will realize that they have a duty to society and should not always try to kick it in the teeth. To teach in a prison atmosphere does not bother me, for I welcome the opportunity to be with kids that receive all too little attention anyway.

Unfortunately, this understanding and concern did not extend to the Institution and the problems of its staff. Most members of the prison staff are as much a product of their own background and environment as the inmates, and they too are filling a particular social role which prescribes certain kinds of expected behavior.

The thrust of the humanities program, however, was directed at the inmates. The teachers, who had the most direct responsibility for accomplishing the goals of the project, first had to break down the traditional staff-inmate barrier and win the cooperation of the inmates. The emphasis of the program required that interaction take place between the teachers and the students, but the prevailing pattern in the Institution is that inmates do not cooperate with staff—they comply. As long as the humanities teachers played a staff role, the students complied. They sat in class; they gave perfunctory answers. It was only when the teachers stepped out of the staff role and identified themselves with the inmates that real cooperation began to take place.

The teachers demonstrated their concern for the students in various ways. They allowed more freedom in the classroom than was customary. The students could sit on windowsills, talk in small groups, read magazines, or sleep; in fact, they could do anything that did not disturb the rest of the students. Some teachers made requests on behalf of the inmates to the superintendent—requests that had previously been denied when made through regular channels.

All of these activities obviously brought the teachers into direct conflict with the Institution. Many of the staff saw the teachers as a group of outside agitators who were stirring up the inmates, belittling the Institution and its goals, and bringing in contraband material that would give the inmates wrong ideas. In the frame of reference within which the prison staff viewed the program, every one of these charges was true.

Whatever the motivations of a new prison employee, he must exercise control if he is to remain a member of the prison staff. The type of inmate behavior that the staff is responsible for enforcing is carefully defined. There are formal rules and guidelines as well as generally accepted practices that guide the actions of staff members. The humanities teachers tended to violate most of the accepted patterns and thus were labeled as outsiders and potential disrupters.

Although the prison staff and the humanities personnel often agreed that their goals were the same, in reality this was not true. The primary goal of the Institution is to retain in physical health and safety the young men sentenced to it by the courts. Within the limits of its resources, the staff at Camp Hill makes an honest effort at rehabilitation, but everyone realizes that their primary responsibility is detention. The goal of the humanities program, on the other hand, was to carry out a research project which tested whether the humanities could bring about changes in its students. If the teachers were ever to interact with the students in an honest, meaningful way, they had to minimize the control function.

In his final report on the project, David Miller expressed the same idea:

> The trust that began to develop [between the humanities teachers and the inmates] was our chief accomplishment. With trust we were able to develop meaningful, active learning situations. If we had had another year I suspect we might have been able to move to a more "academic" sort of operation.
>
> The trust-building took a long time, and was made easier by the fact that we didn't have any custodial responsibilities (and ignored the ones given us). Without that kind of obligation, the primary one for everyone on the staff at Camp Hill, we were not forced regularly into the double bind inherent in the apparently conflicting aims of custody and education. Free of that double bind, we could also be sensitive to many of the students' emotional needs that the staff had to ignore. The need of regular staff to work within this double bind leads, I think, to a kind of clichéd, self-fulfilling way of thinking and operating with the inmates. We were told "not to get too close," that the kids would constantly try to use and trick us, that *en masse* they were "bad," but that as individuals they were "good."
>
> The biggest problems in the program arose out of the implicit conflict between our assumptions, limited responsibility, and style and those of the institutional staff. The efforts that were made to bridge the gap came too late and were too limited to have much effect. We saw at the beginning that the program's and Institution's assumptions were wide apart. Much effort should initially have been put into planning a course and style which were not so threatening to them and into regularly informing the staff of what we were about and where we wanted to go. As it was, I'm sure we had an impact on some of the students, but I'm sure most of the institutional staff involved are glad we're gone. Although the project aimed at "reforming" the students, it is the Institution that needs it first.

A continuous point of contention between the humanities program and the Institution was the clearance of books, magazines, and other instructional materials. All reading material brought into Camp Hill is reviewed. Most literature dealing with blacks in contemporary society, books with explicit sexual passages, and books on psychology are banned. Popular magazines are screened to remove pictures of nude or briefly clad women. Any material which could conceivably "give the inmates bad ideas" is restricted.

Paperback books were among the most popular items in the humanities program; they offered endless variety and could cater to all types of interests. As the teachers kept probing for interests and attempting to supply books to meet these interests, a backlog of books awaiting clearance developed. When the teachers pressured the staff member responsible for reviewing the books, he would go through a stack basing his judgments largely on the cover pictures and the description of the contents on the back covers. Anyone who has glanced at a paperback display knows that publishers have discovered that sex and sensationalism sell books. By these criteria many excellent books, such as Faulkner's *Sanctuary* and Malamud's *The Fixer*, were rejected. Other books, such as Updike's *Rabbit Run* and Mailer's *The Naked and the Dead*, which were certainly just as objectionable by the Institution's standards, were admitted.

The reviewer could not, of course, be expected to be familiar with every book submitted, nor could he be expected to scan them with great care. The apparent irrationality of his decisions, however, left the teachers with little guidance as to what would be approved. The teachers responded by trying to bring in just about anything the students requested on the chance that it might be passed. If it was not, the blame could be placed on the Institution, and the teachers could preserve their relationship with the students.

Books were not the only materials which had to be approved. The teachers wanted to bring glue, scissors, and old magazines to make collages. Rubber cement was not acceptable because the inmates could sniff it, only blunt plastic scissors could be used, and the magazines had to be screened to remove suggestive pictures. The regular staff members were almost embarrassed to mention these restrictions, but they were rules of the Institution and had to be enforced.

More pernicious than these restrictions on materials, however, were restrictions on topics that could be discussed in the classroom. It was almost inevitable that as the inmates began to trust the teachers, they would begin to bring issues of a more sensitive nature into the classroom. In fact, this was the objective of the program. It soon became apparent that the major interests of the black students concerned their race, their place in contemporary society, the contributions that blacks had made to mankind and specifically to America, and other similar topics. Many of the whites, in turn, were protofascists and wanted to read books dealing with the Ku Klux Klan and Nazi Germany. The teachers attempted to respond to these interests by designing courses that would treat the topics within a broad social and political context.

The proposed syllabi revealed little of an inflammatory nature. In the climate that then prevailed in the Institution, however, the prison staff was very reluctant to allow these courses to be presented. It should be recalled that there had been two major racial incidents in the Institution —one in May 1968, a few months before the humanities program started, and another in November 1968. The two suggested courses were proposed in February 1969 during the very week that the trial of the inmates charged in the November attack was conducted. The prison authorities were very concerned that the white inmates might view the offering of a minorities history course as a concession to the blacks and that this would cause the whites to organize for their own protection. They were also concerned, since the choice of the two courses would be voluntary, that only blacks would choose minority history and only whites political forces. Without a racial mixture in the classes, discussion may have only reinforced existing attitudes and prejudices.

In addition to these specific objections, the administration had a general rationale for the avoidance of sensitive topics. Essentially, they argued that the humanities classes were unlike almost any other prison activity. In these classes the students were encouraged to be frank about their feelings and opinions, and the teachers specifically tried to bring about discussion and argument among the inmates. The staff was concerned, first, whether the humanities teachers were capable of controlling the situation if a really intense argument developed. Even if it were granted that the teachers could do so, their second and more important concern was that after a session in the freedom of the humanities classes, the inmates had to return to the much less permissive environment of the rest of the prison. The question they raised was whether these inmates could manage the transition. The staff was concerned that discussion of such controversial topics might cause the underlying staff-inmate and racial hostilities to burst forth.

The humanities staff was sympathetic to these arguments and decided to offer courses that stressed process rather than content. These were the improvisational drama and film-making courses. The basic interests of the students found expression in these courses, and the teachers discovered that students learn more when the teachers openly learn with them. The drama course, which began with both blacks and whites, gradually became all black, and a play concerning life in the ghetto evolved. Likewise, in the film-making class, the students frequently filmed mock fights between blacks and whites. For students not interested in these "artsy-craftsy" courses, a course in the modern novel was offered, and the prison officials approved some books by black authors which had previously been banned.

SUMMARY

The humanities program went through four rather distinct phases. First was the initial preparation which took place before the program began. The basic instructional technique was to present some provocative material which would then be discussed. An overall structure to tie the materials together was developed, and films, short stories, and art works appropriate to this structure were selected. In the second phase the teachers attempted, generally unsuccessfully, to implement the structure, but there was insufficient response from the students to continue with the original stimulus-discussion framework. The teachers then organized three optional areas (courses) among which the students could choose: art and creative writing, power relationships in society, and contemporary music. These constituted the third phase. The fourth phase was another set of optional courses which were more closely attuned to the students' interests: film-making, improvisational drama, and the modern novel.

The program encountered two main problems. The first of these concerns the role which the teachers assumed. To reach the students on a meaningful level, the teachers found it necessary to identify themselves with the inmates. As long as the teachers represented the prison staff and authority, they obtained little cooperation from their students. When, however, they showed the students they were on their side, they obtained cooperation but were labeled by the prison staff as a potential source of disruption.

The other major problem was caused by restrictions which were placed on the program. Some topics, such as race, were considered by the prison officials as too dangerous to be discussed in the humanities classes. They were concerned that such discussion and the materials that would be used might cause incidents either in the classroom itself or elsewhere in the Institution. The teachers believed that these restrictions prevented them from coming to grips with the issues of greatest interest to their students. This impasse was partially resolved by organizing courses that stressed process rather than content.

6

EVALUATION OF THE EXPERIMENTAL PHASE

The evaluation procedures used in the humanities project were designed to assess both the immediate and long-range effects of the program. This chapter examines the immediate effects by analyzing the changes in measures administered at the beginning and end of the program.

Because it is inherently difficult to assess the diverse effects of a humanities program, and because all psychological and educational testing instruments contain unavoidable cultural biases, it was decided to utilize a number of instruments to determine whether they yield similar results. Essentially, the researchers were concerned with two general areas: acceptance of the program and changes in the students.

The first set of evaluations focused on the degree to which the humanities students accepted the program, enjoyed taking part in it, and attempted to gain something from their participation. From the beginning, these were considered important indicators of program success because the idea of coercing changes in values, beliefs, and attitudes was seen not only as contrary to the concept of the humanities but also as nearly impossible to accomplish. To evaluate acceptance of the program, anonymous questionnaires were administered, and the students were interviewed after the program was completed.

The second aspect to be evaluated was concerned with measured changes in the students during the time period in which the program was in operation. A battery of six personality and attitude scales and one scholastic achievement test was administered before and after participation in the humanities course.

ACCEPTANCE OF THE PROGRAM

Most programs that attempt to alter attitudes and behavior patterns depend upon the support and acceptance of the participants. The humanities program was no exception. After the initial period of suspicion wore off, students' acceptance of the program and the teachers appeared to be at a high level, and the majority of the inmates gradually became enthusiastic about the activities in their humanities classes. In order to obtain a quantitative measure of program acceptance, students were given the opportunity to voice their opinions about the course in a brief, anonymous questionnaire. The questionnaire was administered twice during the program by members of the administrative staff of Penn State, who had little daily contact with the students, rather than by the humanities teachers themselves. The first administration took place midway through the program, and the second administration occurred on the last night of the regularly-scheduled compulsory classes.

The data obtained from these questionnaires (see Table A-1, Appendix A) indicate that general acceptance of the course was high. On the first administration, the majority of students reported that they liked the program, found it interesting, and learned something. Though most of the students thought that the program had changed their minds about some things, the majority did not believe that what they had learned would be useful to them either in prison or after their release. The results of the second questionnaire were similar to the first; statistical analysis indicated that no significant changes in response occurred over time.

These questionnaire results were reinforced by the responses obtained from personal interviews with the subjects. The interviews with both experimental and control subjects took place during a two-week period after completion of the program. Outside interviewers, who had no previous connection with the project and who were not known by any of the subjects, were hired. Each interview was tape recorded and lasted approximately one hour.

The interviews made it possible to compare the humanities students' reactions to the humanities course, to the prison's educational program, and to the educational program of the high school they attended before entering prison. The students were not asked to make direct comparisons of these programs; rather the same questions were asked about each program in different sections of the questionnaire. Thirteen out of fourteen comparisons were statistically significant, with the students responding most positively toward the humanities program and most negatively toward the prison school in every case (see Appendix Table A-2). Reactions to their high school experiences were intermediate—less positive than reactions to the humanities course and less negative than reactions to the prison school.

These results would seem to indicate that the humanities course, by giving the students more freedom in class than they were used to, made them less satisfied with the prison's educational program; however, comparisons between the responses of humanities students and those of the control subjects demonstrate that this was not the case. Ten of the fourteen comparisons produced no statistically significant differences (see Appendix Table A-3). Both experimental and control subjects were generally negative toward their educational experiences in prison.

On three of the four questions where differences were found, it was only a question of which group was more negative.

These results indicate that the students' acceptance of the humanities course was quite substantial. The subjects also demonstrated their support for the program in a conclusive manner. During the regular evening school at the Institution, attendance at the humanities classes was compulsory. As the date for the end of spring semester classes approached, however, the project staff believed that they were just beginning to make some real progress. It was therefore requested that the prison allow the course to continue for an additional six weeks on a voluntary basis. There was some skepticism that any of the students would be willing to attend evening classes after the end of the regular school year, especially when it would mean giving up highly valued alternatives such as "yard time," when the inmates are allowed the freedom of the athletic fields on warm evenings, television viewing, or card-playing. Of the forty-one students enrolled in the course at the time, twenty-five volunteered to attend six hours of class per week for the six-week extension. To make sure their intentions were honest, the students were told that once they volunteered to continue, attendance for the six hours per week would be compulsory. All of the volunteers continued for the six weeks unless they were prevented by work assignments. This was undoubtedly the most productive period of the program.

CHANGES IN THE STUDENTS

To evaluate changes in students which were attributable to the humanities program, tests were administered before and after the program, and the results for the humanities students were compared to the results for the matched control groups. This design permitted an analysis of the status of the experimental and control groups prior to the program (pretest analysis), an analysis of the status of these groups following the program (posttest analysis), and an analysis of the pre to posttest changes within each group.

The pretests were administered to all groups approximately one week before the start of the humanities course. Approximately one week after the end of regular classes, the posttests were administered to the two control groups and to those humanities students who did not elect to continue into the voluntary phase of the course. For these students about seven months elapsed between the pretests and posttests. Those students who elected to continue into the voluntary phase of the course were posttested about ten days after the completion of the extra six weeks. The tests were administered to groups of about thirty subjects at one time, and the testing period for each subject lasted about two hours. The following tests and scales, which are described in Appendix B, were administered at each session: Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory, Rosenzweig P-F (Picture-Frustration) Study, Internal-External Scale, Adjective Check List, Jesness Inventory, and Attitudes toward Law Scale. In addition to the above, the Stanford Advanced Paragraph Meaning Test of reading ability was administered only on a posttest basis, and the results were compared to the reading achievement scores which the prison obtains from each inmate when he enters the Institution. This extra testing was an attempt to determine whether the students' eager response to the program's paperback book library had led to any measurable increases in their reading ability.

Pretest Analysis

It was shown previously that significant pre-experimental differences existed among the humanities, GED control, and vocational control groups in spite of the attempts which were made to match the subjects across groups. The vocational group had a higher average age and more average schooling than the other two groups, while the tested reading ability of the humanities students was more than one grade-level above that of the control subjects. In order to ascertain whether any other differences existed among the groups on variables of concern to the student progress evaluation, the pretest scores from each test and its subscales were subjected to a comparative statistical analysis.

After forty-nine comparisons had been made, eight statistically significant differences across groups were found (see Appendix Table C-1). In summary, these differences indicate that the humanities group displayed less emotional repression; the vocational group had a greater need for order and a higher level of self-confidence; and the GED control group showed less test defensiveness (MMPI, K Scale), a tendency toward greater immaturity, a greater need for emotional support (succorance), greater unfavorability toward themselves, but less of a tendency to deny the existence of unpleasant realities. It should be noted, however, that because of the great number of comparisons which were made, some differences may occur simply by chance.

In terms of reactions to frustration, the subjects as a whole tended to respond in an extrapunitive, rather than intrapunitive or impunitive manner; that is, the majority of their aggressive reactions to frustration in interpersonal situations were directed outward toward the environment, rather than directed inward or denied as one's response. This tendency toward extrapunitiveness is also found among the general population but occurred with greater frequency among these subjects. The Picture-Frustration scores also indicate that ego-defensive responses predominated over obstacle dominance and need persistence responses; that is, the subjects were more likely to protect their egos from any threat inherent in a frustrating situation than to direct their response toward the cause of the frustration or toward attempts to satisfy the need being blocked. Again, a predominance of ego-defensive responses is to be expected, but the tendency was exaggerated in the subject sample. Not surprisingly, the group conformity rating of the subjects was found to be lower than that of the normative population, for in this case group conformity is defined as conforming to societal norms for behavior in frustrating situations, rather than conforming to peer group norms.

On the MMPI the only significant difference among groups was found on the K Scale, an internal validity scale used to correct for test defensiveness or "social desirability" responses, but the average scores of all three groups on this scale (and on the Lie Scale, another internal validity scale) were well within normal limits, with a slight tendency to be lower than those of the normative population. On the other MMPI scales used in this study, however, the prison inmates in all three groups responded in an extremely aberrant manner. Their group scores on the Psychopathic Deviation (Pd) Scale, for instance, were nearly three standard deviations above the mean of the normal population. Incarcerated juvenile delinquents would, of course, be expected to have higher scores on this scale. Compared to the results of a study by Silver (1963), where normal adolescents averaged 18 on the Pd scale, "environmental delinquents" averaged 22, and reform school "trouble makers" averaged 26, the present sample of delinquents produced average scores of 25—higher than Silver's environmental delinquents and nearly as high as the trouble makers who had long histories of offenses while incarcerated.

Panton (1962) has demonstrated that the MMPI Parole Violation Scale can predict instances of parole violation with an accuracy rate of 80 percent, using a cutoff score of 10. The mean scores of the inmates in the present study were well above this cutoff score, being more than two standard deviations above the normally obtained average score for prison inmates. This would suggest a strong potential for parole violation in the sample tested.

The inmates' responses to the Jesness Inventory are reported in terms of T-scores, a standard score transformation with a defined mean of 50 and a standard deviation of 10 for the normative population. The average response of the inmates in the present study was more extreme than that of a normal population on all scales except Social Anxiety, Repression, and Denial. Their scores on the Social Maladjustment Scale and the Asocial Index (the scales most indicative of juvenile delinquency) were more than two standard deviations above the normative mean. In relation to Jesness' comparative data on delinquent and nondelinquent adolescents (1966), the present subjects' responses were more extreme than those of Jesness' delinquents on the Social Maladjustment, Value Orientation, Autism, Alienation, and Manifest Aggression Scales, and equalled those of the delinquents on the Immaturity and Withdrawal Scales and the Asocial Index. On the two scales where significant differences were found in favor of the GED control group (immaturity and denial), these differences indicated greater delinquent tendencies.

Although adequate normative data are not available for comparisons on the Internal-External (I-E) Scale and the Attitudes toward Law Scale, the scores of the inmates are not as extreme as might have been expected of socially immature, alienated, and aggressive delinquents. Scores on the I-E Scale can vary from 0 to 23, with a midpoint of 12.5. The means for the subjects in this study were slightly below the midpoint but slightly higher than the means reported by Rotter (1966) for various samples. None of the samples in Rotter's report are really comparable to the present groups since most of Rotter's subjects were drawn from college populations. Nevertheless, the inmates' scores are only slightly more externally oriented (believing, for example, that luck and fate are more important than hard work and determination in getting ahead) than the scores of the college groups. Scores on the Attitudes toward Law Scale can vary between 30 and 150, with a midpoint of 90. Here, the inmates responded with attitudes which were near the middle of the scale, with a tendency toward the negative end. To provide a basis for comparison, the same scale was administered to 179 college males enrolled in an introductory course in economics at Penn State. Their average score of 101 was significantly higher ($p < .001$) than the average score of the inmates; however, the absolute amount of the difference, approximately 10 points, is not as large as might be expected. It is somewhat surprising that the inmates' attitudes were not more negative, given the nature of their experiences with the law.

On most scales of the Adjective Check List (ACL) the inmates' responses were very near the defined T-score mean of 50. They did, however, tend to fall below the normal population in terms of need for order and nurturance, favorability toward self, self-confidence and self-control, and personal adjustment. It should also be pointed out that responses to the ACL scales of aggression and defensiveness did not appear to agree with similar scales on the Jesness Inventory (Manifest Aggression) and the MMPI (K Scale—test defensiveness).

In summarizing the results of the pretesting, then, two conclusions appear to be warranted. First, few significant pre-experimental differences were found to exist between experimental and control subjects. Most of the differences which were found distinguished the GED control group from the humanities and vocational control groups, but did not distinguish between the experimental group and the two control groups. Second, an overview of the test responses of the entire subject population indicated that on the Picture-Frustration, MMPI, and Jesness tests the inmates in this study responded in a manner indicating very high levels of proneness to delinquency, their average scores being even higher (in some cases) than those found in other groups of incarcerated delinquents. On the other hand, their responses to the Internal-External Scale, the Attitudes toward Law Scale, and the Adjective Check List did not differ greatly from the responses which one would expect to find in a sample of noncriminal citizens.

In order to present as unbiased a picture as possible, the above pretest analyses are based upon the responses of all subjects who took the pretests, a sample which numbered as high as 155. It should be noted, however, that in the pre to posttest analyses which follow, the size of the pretest sample shrinks to eighty-eight, so that comparisons of pretested groups with posttested groups could be accomplished using groups which are composed of exactly the same individuals. If all those who took pretests were compared with all those who took posttests, the two groups would have been composed of many different individuals, and it would have been impossible to determine whether any differences (or lack of differences) were due to experimental effects or to the composition of the groups.

In most field experiments it is, unfortunately, difficult to control entrance into and exit from the subject population. In the present study, even within the confines of a prison, this was found to be the case. Although many inmates wanted to enroll in the humanities program during the school year, it was possible to control entrance into the study. Exit from the study, however, was not as easily controlled. The subject population suffered a 36 percent decrease in size during the nine-month period between subject selection and final posttesting. Of the 177 inmates selected as subjects, pretest data were available for 155 and posttest data for only 114. Only eighty-eight subjects were available for personal interviews one month after the end of the course, resulting in the loss of another 14 percent. The reasons behind this high rate of attrition are varied: a juvenile court judge may undergo a change of heart or yield to parental pressure and order an inmate released; an inmate may be called back to court because new evidence has reopened his case; for disciplinary reasons an inmate may be put into solitary confinement or transferred to another prison; serious illness may intervene; a new work assignment may conflict with the inmate's educational program; the inmate may unexpectedly be granted an early release because he is judged fit to return to society. These events are not amenable to experimental control.

The alteration of the composition of the pretest sample caused slight changes in the average scores of the groups involved. Although these changes were, for the most part, very small, they did result in a loss of statistical significance for seven of the eight previously described pretest differences among groups. In most cases this was a function of the reduced size of the groups, leading to reduced degrees of freedom in the statistical tests, rather than in substantial changes in the relationships between the average scores of the groups.

Pre to Posttest Analysis

The data in Appendix Table D-1 show that the humanities group changed significantly on almost every scale of the Rosenzweig Picture-Frustration test. These changes, however, were not all in a rehabilitative direction. The humanities students actually became more extrapunitive, rather than impunitive; more ego-defensive, at the expense of need persistence; and less socially conforming in their responses to frustration. The scores of the control groups on this test were generally in the same direction as those of the humanities group but were not of the same magnitude and failed to reach statistical significance. Some of these changes may have been due to slightly different sets among the test scorers for the pre and posttests since the scoring of this measure is partially subjective. Interscorer comparisons were made and the same scorers were used for both administrations, but consistency in the direction of most of the changes suggests that the raters' judgments may have been slightly different at the two time periods. Even if this accounts for some of the differences, the magnitude of the changes was larger in the humanities group.

In contrast, almost no significant change, either in a positive or a negative direction, was found on the MMPI scales. The subjects in all three groups began the study at high levels of psychopathic deviation, alienation, and proneness to parole violation, and they tended to stay at those high levels. On the Jesness Inventory, however, significant changes were found on about half of the scales. Again, most of the significant differences were found in the humanities group, which experienced greater alienation and repression but less withdrawal, social anxiety, and denial of unpleasant realities. No changes were found on the Asocial Index, the major predictive scale of the test.

A substantial drop in attitudes toward law occurred during the nine-month period of the study. This drop was larger and statistically significant for both the humanities and GED control groups, but it also occurred to some extent in the vocational control group. The general lowering of attitudes toward law in all of the subjects suggests that the drop was a function of imprisonment, per se, rather than a result of the present experiment. Most of the inmates had not been imprisoned at the Institution very long before pretesting, so that this result was probably an adverse effect of several months of detention.

A scattered series of changes were found on the Adjective Check List for both the humanities and GED control groups. Both groups showed a greater need for order and less need for support (succorance) over the time period, indicating that the prison experience may have been developing the need for order which its regimentation is designed to produce. In general, however, few substantial changes were found. Although this instrument yields more scale scores than any of the other measures, it is essentially a self-concept measure and is not as sensitive to the more basic personality changes that the Rosenzweig, MMPI, and Jesness are designed to assess. The failure to find more significant changes in the ACL may be due to this characteristic.

As was expected, a statistically significant improvement in reading comprehension occurred in the humanities students. Their posttest reading achievement scores showed a gain equivalent to 1.5 school years over the scores which they obtained when tested upon entrance to prison. The GED control group also improved the equivalent of one school year in reading ability, but this increase failed to reach statistical significance.

In summary, more statistically significant changes were found among the humanities subjects than among the control subjects, but overall there were fewer changes than nonchanges. The changes that did occur were not all in a "positive" direction, but the humanities program was not designed to indoctrinate "good" values. Its intention was to expose the students to a wider perspective and to lead them to think about questions and issues they had never considered previously. Such exposure may not necessarily lead to more socially acceptable attitudes.

The changes in the various scales of the Jesness Inventory present a pattern very much in agreement with the objectives of the humanities program. The decrease in the withdrawal and denial mean scores suggests that at the end of the program the humanities students had a more realistic perception of themselves and their environment. The Withdrawal Scale reflects ". . . a tendency to resolve a lack of satisfaction with self and others by passive escape or isolation. The individual who scores high perceives himself as depressed, dissatisfied with himself, sad, misunderstood; although preferring to be alone, he feels lonesome" (Jesness, 1966, p. 14). The drop in scores for this scale indicates that the humanities course tended to decrease these feelings.

The items in the Denial Scale of the Jesness Inventory tap three areas: "About half of the items concern the individual's perception of his family, the high scorers seeing their parents without fault and admitting to no conflict with them; another group of items suggests denial of personal inadequacies or unhappiness; and a final group indicates unwillingness to criticize others" (Jesness, 1966, p. 15). The decrease in scores on this scale among the humanities students indicates that after the program they were more likely to admit to inadequacies, conflict, and personal unhappiness. Furthermore, given that the environment of a prison is not very pleasant, increased distrust and estrangement from others, especially authority figures, as indicated by the increase in the alienation score, seems a most natural result of increased awareness. Similarly, the increase in the repression scores can be interpreted as a heightened need to avoid a reality of which the humanities students have become more painfully aware.

The results of the Rosenzweig Picture-Frustration Study support this interpretation. The humanities students became more extrapunitive and less impunitive—that is, more likely to turn the anger caused by frustration towards their environment and less likely to ignore or gloss over the frustration. The increase in extrapunitiveness was associated with an increased tendency to defend the ego from information which may be threatening. This increase in ego defensiveness is similar to the increase in the Repression Scale of the Jesness Inventory. Although these changes do not indicate positive personal growth, they do reflect an understandable reaction to the realities of prison life.

It should be noted, however, that all the data do not support these conclusions. The comparable ACL and MMPI scales did not reflect changes similar to the Jesness and Rosenzweig scales discussed above. *Ad hoc* analyses are, of course, very likely to lead to spurious conclusions. Nevertheless, the difficulties of assessing a project such as the humanities program suggest that the courage to draw plausible, but not definitive, conclusions may be more necessary than the safer course of displaying proper scientific caution. The pattern of changes which was found is so directly related to the types of changes the humanities program tried to bring about, and appears to be such an understandable reaction to the prison environment, that it seems overly cautious to dismiss the changes because all of the measures did not show a similar pattern. The changes that did occur indicate that the humanities students became more aware of themselves and the conditions in their lives, although this did not necessarily make them happier or more adjusted to these conditions.

Posttest Analysis

The preceding analysis was a comparison of pre to posttest changes within groups. If the comparisons are made across groups for the posttests only, no significant differences are found. This finding is not incompatible with the results presented above. When an analysis is concerned with the changes over time within a group, the variability across groups is not considered. When the analysis concentrates on the differences among groups at one point in time, the variability across groups is compared to the pooled variability within groups.

In the posttest comparisons there was so much variability within the groups that no apparent effect of the humanities program was detectable. That is, the differences within the groups were as large as the differences among them. This seems to be due to the differential effects which the total prison experience produces in different inmates. Stated in the simplest way, a prison does different things to different people.

The heterogeneous effect of the prison was discovered when the correlations of the various measures administered before and after the program were examined. It was found that these correlations were lower than those usually obtained. Each subject's pretest score was correlated with his posttest score for every subscale of every test. These test-retest reliability coefficients, or stability coefficients, are traditionally calculated to indicate how reliably the tests measure basic variables which are expected to remain relatively stable over a period of time. For example, if the average test scores of an experimental group and a control group are divergent from pretest to posttest and the reliability coefficients within each group are of sufficient magnitude, then a conclusion that the experimental manipulation or condition had a consistent, measurable effect is warranted. If, however, the pretest to posttest reliability of the measurements is not of sufficient magnitude, then the data must be interpreted with caution because the direction of measured change within each group has not been consistent.

This latter result, unfortunately, was found in all of the test data gathered for the evaluation of the humanities experiment. Over a period of eight to ten months, the lower limit of acceptable pre to posttest correlation coefficients is generally about .70. In the humanities group, the reliabilities for different tests varied over a range of .09 to .74 with an average reliability of .41. Similar results were found in the two control groups.

In attempting to account for the low stability of the test scores, two alternative explanations seem plausible. The first of these is based upon the observation that most of the inmates were very test-shy, directed hostility toward the test administrators, and communicated an air of uneasiness during the testing sessions. It was therefore suggested that the low reliabilities might be a function of the subjects' hostility toward the testing, assuming that this hostility led them to respond in a random fashion rather than in an honest manner. The acceptance of this explanation would, of course, invalidate the results of the testing program. The second explanation assumes that the subjects had responded to the tests in an honest, nonrandom manner and that the lack of stable responses within groups was a function of wide variations in pre to posttest scores due to a great deal of change (in both positive and negative directions) on the part of individual subjects. These individual variations seemed to be unrelated to the manner in which the subjects were grouped in this experiment.

A closer inspection of the data indicated that the first explanation, assuming random responding by the inmates, was untenable. Within-group variances were not excessively large on either the pretests or the posttests, and the standard errors were smaller than those found in normative studies. In addition, when several variables were regressed against posttest scores, the pretest was the one variable which consistently produced statistically significant regression coefficients, indicating that the greatest portion of the variance in posttest scores was accounted for by the pretests themselves. Most importantly, relationships which were found among test scores at the time of pretesting consistently reappeared in the posttest data. These relationships were in the same directions and were of approximately the same magnitude in both pretests and posttests, over the total sample of subjects and within each group. The pattern of these results can only lead to the conclusion that the subjects were responding to the tests in some rational and consistent manner.

The second explanation still seems acceptable. Considerable change in individual subjects seems to have occurred during the time period of the humanities program, with some individuals changing in a positive direction and some in a negative direction. Only a few of these changes can be attributable to the effects of the humanities course, as indicated by the pretest to posttest differences. Therefore, it seems plausible that most of these changes were a function of the complex of variables which at the present time can only be termed "the prison environment."

It appears that the total prison experience produces different types of changes in different people. To test how these different effects might occur, the measures which were administered to evaluate the experimental phase of the humanities program were compared to the recidivism data gathered during the follow-up of the inmates. These results, which are presented in the next chapter, suggest that for nonrecidivists prison is a less damaging experience than for recidivists. The scores of both recidivists and nonrecidivists were more discrepant from normal patterns on the posttests than on pretests, but the recidivists' scores tended to change more than the scores of the nonrecidivists. In other words, prison was a negative experience for all of the inmates, but it was especially so for those most likely to engage in new criminal activity following their release. These and other follow-up results are discussed in more detail in the next chapter.

SUMMARY

The results of the assessment techniques used to evaluate the immediate effects of the humanities program are reported in this chapter. The findings indicate that the program was well received by most of its students and apparently had some effect on their perceptions. Stated in nontechnical terms, the humanities students seemed to have become more aware. Their responses to two of the main evaluation instruments, the Jesness Inventory and the Rosenzweig Picture-Frustration Study, indicate a decrease in their tendency to deny or ignore some of the realities of their lives. Together with this decrease in denial, however, was an increased need to shield themselves from some of the unpleasant realities of which they had become more aware. This reaction is quite understandable when the life space of the typical prison inmate is considered.

Chapter 3 described in some detail the life space of the typical prisoner. His existence is, for the most part, barren, threatened, and frustrated. He is denied most of the normal sources of support and is provided with few positive alternatives. Having participated in a program which made them more aware of their condition, it is not surprising that the humanities students revealed a tendency to try to avoid, through repression and ego defense, these realities.

Yet perhaps this conclusion should not be drawn quite so definitively. There is some evidence to support the interpretation presented above, but not all of the measures showed the same pattern. There were no comparable changes in the Adjective Check List or selected scales of the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory. Nor did the humanities students differ significantly from the two control groups on any of the measures administered after the program. In other words, when the results of the measures administered to the humanities students before and after the program were compared, it was clear that the humanities students changed in the ways described above. The inmates in the control groups, who took the same measures, did not show the same changes. However, when the humanities students were compared to the control inmates on the measures administered after the program, the humanities students did not differ significantly from the others.

These results are not incompatible. They indicate that considerable change was taking place in most of the inmates. These changes were further confirmed by low stability in the scores obtained for the same inmates before and after the humanities program. It seems that the prison experience was having different effects on different people; some seemed to move in a positive direction and some in a negative direction. Only a few of these changes can be directly attributed to the humanities program, but those that can be so attributed followed directly from the objectives of the program. The humanities students did become more aware of themselves and their environment.

7

RECIDIVISM, EMPLOYMENT, AND MAJOR PROBLEMS AFTER LEAVING PRISON

All but two of the inmates who participated in the humanities study were released from prison during the thirty-three months covered in the follow-up. What kind of lives did they lead following their release? Is there any evidence that their experiences in prison were related to their postrelease adjustment? These are the basic questions asked of any study concerned with the effects of correctional experiences, and they are, in a general sense, the questions that this and the following chapter attempt to answer.

Before any such attempt could be made, however, the questions had to be phrased in a manner that permitted them to be answered. "What kind of lives did the former inmates lead?" is too general a formulation. Questions that could guide the collection of data were needed to judge the effects of prison experiences. Therefore, this chapter is addressed to the following questions:

1. How many of the released inmates were convicted of new criminal offenses?
2. What type of employment experiences did they have following their release?
3. What were the major problems they encountered?

These questions seem relatively straight-forward, but defining just what constitutes new criminal offenses and comparing employment experiences among the former humanities students, regular academic (GED) students, and vocational students caused considerable difficulty. The nature of this difficulty is explained in some detail in this chapter.

Overall, it can generally be concluded that there were no significant differences among the groups on any of the major variables. This means, of course, that the students who participated in the experimental humanities program did not differ from the other former inmates on any of the measures of postprison adjustment. There was no evidence that exposing young prison inmates to the humanities resulted in less likelihood of new criminal activity, in better employment records, or in different kinds of problems encountered following release.

Table 1. Classification of Subjects at Each Follow-up Interview by Program

	Humanities (N=58)			GED (N=58)			Vocational (N=57)		
	% 1970	% 1971	% 1972	% 1970	% 1971	% 1972	% 1970	% 1971	% 1972
In society	54	42	51	51	38	36	69	61	58
Employed	33	28	28	28	22	21	39	40	37
Unemployed	16	12	14	21	16	12	28	17	14
Military service	5	2	9	2	–	3	2	4	7
In prison	31	41	33	21	33	31	14	21	23
Fugitive	2	3	2	2	–	2	3	4	–
	33	44	35	23	33	33	17	25	23
Deceased	3	3	5	2	3	3	–	–	–
No data	10	10	10	26	26	28	14	14	19
Total[a]	100	99	101	102	100	100	100	100	100

[a] Totals differ from 100% due to rounding

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

DEFINITION AND PREDICTION OF RECIDIVISM

Defining Recidivism

The major point of interest in any follow-up study of former prisoners is how many of them are able to lead a noncriminal life following their release from prison. Table 1 presents data on the subjects in the present study. These figures indicate that during the total follow-up period about half of the subjects were performing some role in regular society, including military service; 30 percent were fugitives or in prison; a few subjects were deceased; and data were not available on the remainder. The figures presented in this table are based on any available information concerning the subjects, but the primary source of information was personal interviews with the subjects themselves. Other sources were interviews with members of the family, reports from parole agents, reports of special commercial investigators who attempted to locate the hard-to-find, and reports from wardens of correctional institutions.

To test if the percentage of subjects in prison or fugitive at the time of the interviews differed significantly among the three groups, chi square tests were run separately for each year. None of the analyses were significant. There was no evidence that particular educational experiences were related to the likelihood that subjects would or would not be in prison or fugitives from the law.

The percentages of fugitives or subjects in prison should *not* be considered as recidivism rates. The figures reflect the status of the subjects at the time of the follow-up interviews rather than the proportion convicted of crimes each year. The continuation of inmates in prison from one year to the next makes these figures higher than the recidivism rates. In 1970, for example, over half of the subjects in the project had not yet been released. By 1972, only two inmates had not been released; however, those incarcerated that year included subjects who were serving sentences they had incurred in 1970–1971. For these reasons the figures in Table 1 *overestimate* the number of new convictions each year.

Recidivism Rates

Recidivism is, of course, the measure most commonly used to assess the effectiveness of correctional programs. Definitions of what constitutes recidivism, however, vary from one study to another and often make it difficult to compare results. In the present study, it was decided to use reports from parole agents rather than self-report measures of recidivism to avoid the possibility of distortion. The parole agent was instructed to record the most serious postrelease criminal offense committed by the releasee. If the agent responded that the subject had no further record, a nonfelony arrest with no conviction, a felony arrest or warrant issued with no conviction, or a misdemeanor conviction, the subject was judged to be a nonrecidivist for that period. If the agent replied that the releasee was reported to be a parole or court release violator or to have a felony conviction with a sentence or probation, the subject was judged to be a recidivist for that period. This classification system was admittedly arbitrary, and there were some problems associated with its use. Only subjects who were actually interviewed by parole agents were covered. Reports from family or friends or interviews conducted by the commercial investigators could not be included under this definition. It is also quite likely that some of the subjects who were not located for follow-up interviews were recidivists.

Percentages of those subjects reported to be recidivists by the parole agents are shown for each year by group in Table 2. There were no significant differences in recidivism among the three groups.

Despite the problems in data collection, the figures in Table 2 do agree rather well with those in Table 1 which were gathered from a variety of sources. The comparisons between the tables are clearest for the year 1970 since anyone returned to prison in 1970 was sentenced for offenses committed that same year.

Table 2. Recidivism[a] Reported by Parole Agents, by Groups by Years

		Humanities	GED	Vocational
1970	Percent	23	20	20
	Base Number	31	29	29
1971	Percent	13	20	21
	Base Number	23	20	24
1972	Percent	18	25	17
	Base Number	22	16	23

[a] Recidivism was defined as a parole or court release violation or a felony conviction with sentence or probation

As was mentioned above, many of those in prison in 1971 and 1972 were serving sentences incurred in earlier years. It was also mentioned above that approximately half of all the subjects in prison in 1970 had not yet been released. When those who were not released from prison are removed from the percentages shown in Table 1, the actual number in each group returned to prison in 1970 is as follows: nine in the humanities group, six in the GED group, and three in the vocational group. The reports from the parole officers indicated that the following numbers were recidivists: seven in the humanities group, six in the GED group, and six in the vocational group. Although there are some discrepancies, there is enough agreement to suggest that the reports from the parole officers—with all of their limitations—generally reflected the frequency of recidivism.

Predicting Recidivism

The accuracy of the recidivism measure was examined at some length, since this variable was the subject of several analyses. The most extensive analyses concerned the personality inventories that were administered at the beginning and end of the school year to assess the effects of the experimental humanities program. The scores of the inmates who were later classified as recidivists were compared to the scores of nonrecidivists for both administrations of the inventories. The significance of the differences between the groups was evaluated using *t*-tests. This analysis tested whether the personality inventories could predict recidivism. The mean pretest and posttest scores of those classified as recidivists and nonrecidivists at each follow-up are presented in Appendix Tables E-1 and E-2.

Unfortunately, none of the measures was a consistent predictor—consistent in the sense that for each comparison the mean for the recidivists was significantly different than the mean for the nonrecidivists. Most of the differences that were found occurred in the 1970 follow-up. This is at least partially due to the larger number of recidivists that year, which increased the probability that the differences between the groups would reach significance.

The instrument that proved most successful in differentiating between recidivists and nonrecidivists was the Rosenzweig, but its success was limited almost entirely to the 1970 follow-up. For that year three of the seven pretest scales and five of the seven posttest scales were significantly different for recidivists and nonrecidivists. In the other two years only one comparison reached significance.

It is interesting to note that the Rosenzweig administered at the end of the humanities program had more significant scales than the same test when it was administered at the beginning of the program. The discussion of the overall pretest to posttest changes presented in Chapter 6 indicated that the Rosenzweig was one of the most sensitive measures of the effects of the program. Over the nine-month period in which the program was in operation, there were heightened tendencies to turn aggression caused by frustration outward toward the environment and decreased tendency to defend the ego from information that may be threatening, coupled with a decrease in activity aimed at resolving the frustration-inducing situation.

The comparison of the subjects classified as recidivists and nonrecidivists indicates that these changes were even more pronounced among the recidivists. In other words, the prison experience seemed to produce these changes in all of the inmates, but it had the most effect upon those inmates who were later convicted of new crimes.

Only one other measure yielded at least two consistent significant differences. That was the posttest administration of the Alienation Scale that differentiated between recidivists and nonrecidivists in both the 1970 and 1972 follow-ups. In both cases, the recidivists had significantly higher scores reflecting ". . . distrust and estrangement in relationships with others, especially with authority figures" (Jesness, 1966, p. 13). The total pattern for the Alienation Scale was the same as for the Rosenzweig—an increase from pretest to posttest for all subjects, but a greater increase for the inmates prone to recidivism. Both of the measures that had some success in distinguishing recidivists from nonrecidivists thus suggest that prison does not rehabilitate nonrecidivists; it is just a less harmful experience for them.

In general, the psychological measures were not good predictors of recidivism. The problems of defining this variable and the variety of circumstances that determine whether or not a released inmate is labeled a recidivist make prediction difficult. The analysis of the in-prison changes for those subjects labeled recidivists suggests that to decrease the probability of recidivism it would first be necessary to eliminate the negative effects of prison.

The employment experiences of the subjects following their release are discussed in the next section. To anticipate this discussion, it can be stated that there were few significant differences between the recidivists and nonrecidivists on such indices as number of jobs held, months employed, socioeconomic status of jobs, average hourly wages, or ratings of job satisfaction. These results tend to contradict the frequent assertion that what inmates really need is job training so they can earn a living when they leave prison. The recidivism analysis of the employment data failed to reveal any consistent differences between the work histories of those who were convicted of new crimes and those who were not. While the ability to obtain employment is certainly a component of successful postprison adjustment, it is obviously not the whole answer to reducing recidivism.

EMPLOYMENT EXPERIENCES

The employment rate of released offenders is second only to recidivism as a measure of postprison adjustment. If the incarceration and recidivism rates reported above were disappointing, the unemployment rates in Table 3 will add to this disappointment.

Table 3. Labor Force Participation and Unemployment Rates among Respondents at Time of Follow-up Interviews

	Humanities			GED			Vocational		
	1970	1971	1972	1970	1971	1972	1970	1971	1972
Labor force participation (percent)	56	46	49	67	54	47	78	67	63
Base number[a]	50	56	49	42	41	40	49	49	46
Unemployment (percent)	32	30	33	43	41	37	42	30	27
Base number[b]	28	23	24	28	22	19	38	33	30

[a] Includes all respondents for whom data were available except those who were deceased.

[b] Includes only respondents in regular society for whom data were available. Respondents in military service, in prison, or fugitives were excluded.

The labor force participation rate is depressed, of course, by the proportion of incarcerated subjects. Their lack of labor force participation is not voluntary, but their absence still depresses the statistics. Among the subjects who were in regular society, the unemployment rates were quite high. For each group of subjects in each follow-up, about one-third or more of the subjects were unemployed at the time they were interviewed.

A Case History

As one reviews the individual job histories of the young men who participated in this study, he is primarily impressed by the "chance" or "haphazard" nature of these histories. Rare is the individual who took one job upon his release from prison and retained it for the entire follow-up period. Much more frequent were histories characterized by a series of jobs to which the workers attached little commitment. The following is the job history of one individual who illustrates this pattern. This history is somewhat more varied than that of the average subject, but it differs in the number and variety of jobs held and not in the basic pattern.

John Stapless (a pseudonym) had been committed to Camp Hill at the age of seventeen after a history of general delinquency but no previous prison sentences. He is white and has a tested IQ of 109. Although his academic skills were about average for young people his age, and thus considerably higher than most inmates at Camp Hill, he had dropped out of high school after completing the tenth grade. The personality measures administered as part of the humanities study indicated that his asocial tendencies were at about the same level as most of the other inmates but that he had very low feelings of self-esteem. Measures of the degree of favorability he felt toward himself ranked him among the lowest in the entire group of subjects as well as in the lowest 1 to 2 percent of a normal population. His adjustment to Camp Hill was generally good, however, and he was released after serving seventeen months, two years earlier than his maximum sentence.

Upon his release he was unemployed for six weeks before taking a job as a laborer with a container manufacturer. He held this job for two months, and his pay was $1.60 per hour for a fifty-hour week. He then took a job with a manufacturer of mobile homes and was employed for a month, laid off for a six-month period, and called back for another three months of work. On this job he started at $2.25 per hour and was making $2.65 when he left, but he was dissatisfied with the nature of the work, with his supervisor, and with the opportunities the job offered. During the time he was laid off, he worked two weeks as a plumber's helper.

After leaving the job with the mobile home manufacturer, John worked one month as a body and fender man for an automobile dealer but had to leave, ironically, because he did not have transportation to get to work. He was then unemployed for five months until he and a friend formed a partnership as carpentry contractors. This prospered for three months during which John's earnings averaged about $200 per week. Unfortunately, his partner had a serious accident at work, and they decided to "give up the business."

John then obtained a construction job where he earned $4.21 an hour, but once more he was laid off after only two months. After being unemployed for a month, he worked as a parking lot attendant for $75 per week. He left this job after one month to take a job as a welder with a manufacturer of steel products. Although he earned $2.91 per hour, he left this job after one month because "the salary was too low." At the time of his last interview he was unemployed. In addition to these jobs, John had held a few others, the details of which he could not recall.

The jobs that John reported totaled 14.5 months of work out of the thirty-three months covered in his follow-up. Thus, he was employed only 44 percent of the time he was available for employment. Data presented below indicate that this figure is considerably below the average for the other subjects for whom complete follow-ups were available. These subjects were employed an average of 69 percent of the time they were available for employment. Nevertheless, the employment experiences of John Stapless vary in degree rather than in kind. It was the rare respondent who had a career in the conventional sense of a series of related jobs. Instead, the subjects appeared to move from one job to another, sometimes at their own initiative and other times at the request of their employers.

Indices of Employment

In attempting to organize the data on the employment experiences of all subjects, several problems were encountered. The major problem was that the number of respondents available for interviews decreased with each follow-up. The differing composition of the groups thus complicated the comparisons over time. (Were the differences that were found due to actual changes or to the differing composition of the sample?) To cite an example, suppose it was found that average wages increased from the first to the third follow-up. Was this because the subjects were acquiring more vocational skills or because the subjects who could be located for the third round of interviews tended to earn higher wages, while those who could not be located earned lower wages?

To overcome this problem two approaches were followed. Since the first round of interviews in 1970 yielded the highest rate of completion, their results were emphasized in the analysis. To give some indication of the adjustment to employment over the total follow-up period, the subjects who participated in all three interviews were analyzed separately. Selecting these more available subjects obviously raises the question as to the degree these subjects are representative of the total sample. Does the very fact that they were available for all three interviews make them atypical? This question can be answered only in terms of the variables which allow comparisons to be made. On these, the matched sample rarely differed significantly from the total sample. Nevertheless, it should be noted that the data for the matched sample are based on less than half the subjects in the original groups, and the data for the first jobs after leaving Camp Hill are based on only about two-thirds of the original groups.

Jobs Held. What kind of jobs did the former inmates of Camp Hill obtain upon their release? About 80 percent or more of the respondents in each of the groups were employed in three main classifications—production jobs in manufacturing firms, structural work for construction firms, and service jobs (see Appendix Tables E-3 and E-4). In these first jobs the former humanities students were under-represented in the construction industry and slightly over-represented in production jobs; however, these differences did not persist over the entire follow-up period.

For all jobs that the subjects obtained, friends and relatives were the main source of information as to the availability of the jobs. These referrals accounted for at least half of the jobs obtained each follow-up year. Personal application to the company, without knowing whether or not a job was available, was the next most frequent method of finding jobs. Other sources of information about jobs were newspaper ads, employment agencies (public and private), and occasionally a parole officer.

Amount of Time Employed. The respondents were employed approximately three-quarters or more of the time they were available for employment during the period preceding the first follow-up (Appendix Table E-5). They were employed approximately the same number of months during the period between the second and third follow-up, but since this was generally a longer period, the percentage of time they were employed declined. Over the total follow-up period, the subjects were employed only slightly more than two-thirds of the time they were available. There is some indication that the inmates who had received vocational training in prison had slightly more stable employment. The differences among the groups, however, were not significant.

Quality of Jobs. Appendix Tables E-6 and E-7 present data on two indications of the quality of jobs which the respondents obtained: the wage they received and the socioeconomic rating of the job. These tables present data for the total sample and for the matched sample, i.e., those subjects for whom all three interviews were available. It should be noted that the number of respondents included in the matched sample is only slightly more than half the number in the total sample. Using only the matched sample, the number of respondents is still not identical for 1970 and 1972, since three respondents did not have jobs both years. Despite all of these problems in the analysis, it appears that the general trend in wages was upward. In almost all cases the wages which the subjects received when they left their jobs were higher than the 1970 rates.

The same trend was not true for the socioeconomic status of their jobs. The measure of socioeconomic status used here was the scale developed by Duncan (1961). This scale was constructed from prestige ratings of representative occupations together with census data on education and income for these occupations. The scale ranges from a high of 96 (dentists, osteopaths) to a low of 0 (laborers in tobacco-manufacture).

The jobs held by the subjects in this study obviously cluster toward the lower end of the scale. Over 90 percent had scores of 30 or less, and half (51 percent) fell in the range from 11 to 20. Some representative occupations in this range are hospital attendants, truck drivers, and operatives in a wide variety of industrial settings, such as steel factories, bakeries, manufacturing plants, and laundries. These are typically jobs for which no prior skills are needed, and the workers learn on the job, usually within a few days, all that they need to know for adequate performance.

As the job histories of the respondents attest, a series of these jobs does not constitute a career. The skills that workers acquire are usually not transferable to any other setting. When a worker leaves one of these jobs, he is still unskilled and can offer only his labor to a new employer. Nor is there much chance for internal advancement.

Job Satisfaction. The limitations of these jobs appeared to be quite clear to the respondents. When they were asked to rate their level of satisfaction with various aspects of their jobs, the opportunities for promotion always ranked lowest in the ratings. The ratings of satisfaction were made on a seven-point scale with a one defined as completely dissatisfied and a seven as completely satisfied. The areas that typically received the lowest ratings, in addition to opportunities for promotion, were the work itself and the rate of pay (see Appendix Table E-8). Interpersonal aspects of the job—co-workers and supervisors—were usually rated fairly positively, as was respect for the job.

The validity of these ratings was tested by administering another measure of job satisfaction, the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) developed by Smith (1969) and her colleagues. This is a well-constructed, standardized measure of job satisfaction. The degree of agreement between it and the ratings indicates that these two techniques yielded similar measures. Individuals who gave high ratings to various aspects of their jobs also tended to score highly on the JDI and vice versa (Appendix Table E-9 shows the pattern of intercorrelations).

Reasons for Leaving Jobs. The reasons the respondents gave for leaving their jobs suggest that most of the changes were not at their employer's request. Data regarding the first jobs held after release from Camp Hill indicate that about one-third of the subjects left because of the job itself or its working conditions, and about one-fourth left because of personal reasons not directly related to the jobs (see Appendix Table E-10). If the respondents' reports are taken at face value, over half left their jobs at their own initiative. There may be considerable rationalization in these answers; that is, a worker who anticipated being fired or laid off may have looked for an excuse to quit. Even allowing for such bias, however, the job histories of these workers are consistent with a pattern of such self-initiated changes. Their jobs were basically dead-end and unrewarding; they tolerated them as long as they could and then left to try to find something better.

Here, in their own words, are some of the respondents' reasons for leaving jobs:

"No chance for advancement."
"I was overworked and didn't like that type of work."
"I quit. I couldn't get along with the supervisor."
"I wanted to go to Florida, so I just left."
"The job was too dirty and too hard."
"I didn't like the hours. I was on call at all times."
"Just felt like quitting."
"To make up time roaming that I lost while at Camp Hill."
"Wanted more hours and more pay."

When the subjects were asked directly if their prison record had anything to do with how well they got along on their jobs, less than 10 percent said it did, and, surprisingly, not all of these comments were negative. Some respondents thought they were taken advantage of or talked about because of their record, but a few said they were held up as positive examples to others, a situation they found satisfying.

Employment and Recidivism

It was noted earlier in the chapter that there were few differences between the employment experiences of recidivists and nonrecidivists.

Table 4 presents a summary of the comparisons of the employment indices of the two groups. Most of these indices have been discussed above; however, it should be noted that in Table 4 the indices are cumulative to the year of the new offense. Thus, the employment indices for the subjects who were classified as recidivists in 1970 cover approximately a one-year period from release until the 1970 follow-up; those for 1971, approximately a two-year period; and those for 1972, approximately a three-year period. All of the indices that refer to more than one job, such as hourly wages, were averaged across all jobs held by each subject.

Out of the thirty-nine comparisons between recidivists and nonrecidivists presented in Table 4, only three were significant, and two of these were for the index "percent of time employed." This index is based on the number of months employed as a proportion of the number of

Table 4. Mean Indices of Employment Experiences, Recidivists and Nonrecidivists by Year of New Offense

Employment Index	1970		1971		1972	
	Recid[a] (N=18)	Nonrecid (N=79)	Recid[a] (N=11)	Nonrecid (N=56)	Recid[a] (N=8)	Nonrecid (N=52)
Numbers of jobs	2.17	2.22	4.09	3.29	4.88	4.13
Equivalent months employed	6.89	7.10	12.46	15.61	18.88	20.56
Percent of time employed	61.72	81.77*	55.36	76.96*	60.12	70.88
SES index	22.11	18.72	20.00	16.18	21.00	20.29
Hours/week	41.11	42.30	43.64	42.43	39.88	42.50
Hourly wage	2.22	2.22	2.43	2.46	2.15	2.29
Satisfaction Ratings						
Work	4.33	4.86	5.10	4.75	4.65	4.93
Pay	4.33	4.40	4.51	4.38	4.48	4.20
Hours	4.56	5.30	4.90	5.25	4.98	5.17
Supervision	4.61	5.16	5.76	5.16	5.35	5.26
Opportunities	3.89	3.98	2.91	4.23*	4.32	3.95
Co-workers	5.72	5.44	5.93	5.64	5.61	5.62
Respect	5.67	5.48	5.44	5.33	5.58	5.30

Note: * Significant at the .05 level of confidence
[a]Recidivism defined from reports of parole agents

months available for employment. Months in which the respondent was incarcerated were not included in the calculation of this ratio. However, the difficulties of obtaining accurate data on the amount of time incarcerated make this a less reliable statistic for the recidivists; that is, some of the time they were incarcerated may not have been reported and thus would have been included in the months available for employment. Raising this figure, months available, relative to the months employed would have lowered the percent of time employed. At any rate, it is clear that the similarities in the employment experiences far outweigh the differences. It is difficult to make a case from these data that employment is the key to preventing additional criminal activity.

MAIN PROBLEMS FOLLOWING RELEASE

Another indication of the kind of lives the subjects led following their release from prison was obtained in response to a question on the main problems they encountered. According to the 1970 results, which are similar to the later results, problems directly related to employment were mentioned by 17 percent of the total sample (see Appendix Table E-11). Only among the former vocational students was this the most frequent category. The more frequent references to vocational problems in this group may reflect an inability to find the kinds of jobs for which they were trained. Some of the actual answers that were coded into the work category were as follows:

> "Getting a better job and a chance to improve myself."
>
> "Not being able to get into the right vocation."
>
> "Trying to find work and a good life, but being at Camp Hill has messed me up."
>
> "Finding a job that I enjoy enough to stick with."
>
> "Meeting certain qualifications for a better job."

Among the humanities and GED subjects, references to personal and interpersonal problems outnumbered references to employment by better than two to one. Even if problems of money-material possessions are considered as resulting from employment problems, other kinds of problems were as frequent as the combined work-money categories. Several respondents said their main problems concerned old friends, especially old girl friends. For example:

> "Staying away from old friends."
>
> "The friends out there are just the same as before."

"Finding a steady companion."

"Girls."

"Finding friends to share my plans with . . . and getting my old girl friend back."

Many other respondents cited problems related to personal feelings or their goals in life:

"Letting off steam and the pressure that has built up inside me over the months."

"Lack of confidence. Feeling insecure. Not being satisfied with my own mind."

"Thinking I was a bad guy."

"My temper."

"An inferiority complex."

"No ambition, interests, or will power."

"Getting a place to settle down. I just feel like traveling all the time."

"Stabilizing my life's activities to some kind of 'status quo' acceptable to everyone."

"Deciding what to do with my life."

It is clear from comments such as these that the most salient problems in the minds of many released offenders were not solely vocational. If prison is to be a rehabilitative experience, it must do more than prepare inmates to find a job. Many inmates must also be helped to understand themselves and to find some meaning in their lives.

Training at Camp Hill

When the respondents were asked in 1970 if the training or education they received at Camp Hill was of any use to them after their release, about half of each group stated that it was (see Appendix Table E-12). As would be expected, the vocational subjects were most likely to mention an increase in vocational skills. This subjective benefit, however, did not appear to be reflected in any of the indices of employment experiences that were discussed previously. In each of the subsequent follow-up years the proportion of respondents who reported they acquired a vocational skill declined.

The proportion of the experimental subjects who referred to the humanities program as directly useful to them was only 4 percent. The humanities students, however, were slightly more likely to report ways in which their time at Camp Hill improved them personally. These comments usually referred to an improved outlook on life, to an increased ability to face reality, to better habits, and so on. Some of the answers that were volunteered by the respondents from the humanities group follow:

> "Taught me respect for my fellow man."
>
> "It has taught me to understand people and have patience."
>
> "How to avoid trouble and do better work."
>
> "To face reality and make it in life, whatever I decide to be."
>
> "I see things more clearly and am able to get along with people and can share their interests."

It is interesting to speculate whether any of these benefits were at least partly the result of experiences in the humanities program. This interpretation is not consistently supported by the data, for the proportion of humanities subjects who cited such personal improvement declined in the subsequent follow-ups. Nevertheless, the first year following release from prison is the time at which the program's effects would be most likely to be detected. Even though the overall distribution of answers does not differ significantly among the groups, if the proportion reporting personal improvement, increased interpersonal skills, and specific reference to the humanities program are combined, the total for the humanities subjects, 30 percent, is significantly higher than the total of these responses in either of the other two groups. This type of analysis is quite suspect, of course, for the investigator greatly increases his chances of selecting comparisons that will yield significant differences. Nevertheless, the results to this question are at least suggestive that the humanities program had some postrelease carryover among some of its students.

The respondents were also asked if they had any suggestions for the improvement of the educational program at Camp Hill (Appendix Table E-13). The most frequent suggestions referred to improving the quality of teachers. For example:

> "Teachers are inferior. They don't care if you learn or not. They only care about an orderly classroom. There are a few exceptions, [but] we need younger teachers who want to help."
>
> "Better teachers who are interested in the boys."

The respondents who had studied vocational skills while at Camp Hill tended to be a little less critical of their teachers but far more likely to suggest changes in the general educational program. Some respondents said that course content should be brought more up-to-date and relate to current events and "real life," but more often they just said that courses should be improved. The suggestions regarding treatment of students and discipline mainly concerned more selective assignment to remove those students who lacked interest.

Although better educational programs in prisons and job placement for released convicts are frequently cited as the keys to reducing recidivism, the data presented in this chapter raise serious questions about these approaches. There is no evidence that any one of the three programs either reduced recidivism or enhanced employment. Of course, these programs were not compared to the absence of any program. If a comparison group that received no prison education were available, all three programs may have proved superior to that group.

SUMMARY

This chapter is concerned with the postrelease adjustment of the former inmates who participated in the humanities study. The criteria of their adjustment are based on recidivism, employment, and personal reports of major problems encountered. For virtually all of the comparisons, there were no significant differences among the three groups. In short, there was no evidence that the humanities program had any significant influence on the postprison behavior of its students. Over the thirty-three-month period covered by the follow-up, 30 percent of the former inmates who participated in the study were returned to prison. Most of the respondents also experienced considerable unemployment. Overall, they were employed only about two-thirds of the time they were available for employment, and at the time of each of the follow-up interviews, one-third or more were unemployed. Despite these employment difficulties, personal and interpersonal problems were mentioned as frequently as employment problems as the major sources of concern to the respondents.

8

ATTITUDES AND VALUES AFTER LEAVING PRISON

The humanities program presented at the Camp Hill prison tried to expose its students to "materials that would aid them in arriving at a sense of personal identity which encompassed their individual strengths and weaknesses, while providing a sense of meaning in life and a set of values consistent with life in society" (Lewis, 1969, p. 3). It was hoped that if the program could achieve these objectives, its students would be aware of a wider number of options in their lives and perhaps be less likely to engage in new criminal activities following their release. The results presented in the preceding chapter showed that participation in the humanities program had no effect on recidivism or employment.

In a sense, however, the results presented in this chapter are even more disappointing. This chapter deals with less tangible data than the preceding one; it is concerned mainly with attitudes and values—personal perceptions and judgments that should have been susceptible to the influence of the humanities program. Unfortunately, the data that were gathered on these variables also failed to show any effects resulting from the program.

The attitudes that are discussed in this chapter were measured because of their close relationship to the objectives and operation of the program. The basic premise of the program was that the humanities could be used to expose young inmates to sets of values and life-alternatives different from those which had dominated their lives prior to their commitment to prison. A second basic approach was to treat each inmate as an individual worthy of respect and to present him with experiences that would maximize his opportunities for success. A third theme, race relations, was forced upon the program by the racial climate in the prison. Originally, there had been no plans to deal with racial tension, but the black-white hostility which prevailed in the Institution forced the humanities program to consider the issue.

To assess the degree to which each of these basic themes influenced the attitudes of the humanities students following their release, a questionnaire composed of several separate scales was developed. These scales were selected from a variety of sources and will be discussed in greater detail in this chapter.

Generally, these measures failed to detect any effects that could be attributed to the humanities program.* There was no evidence that the subjects who participated in the program had different values and goals in their lives, had higher self-esteem and feelings of personal competence, or were more supportive of racial equality than former inmates from the regular academic program and the vocational program. Nor was there any evidence that the humanities students were more likely to engage in the activities to which they were exposed in the program, such as attend a play or read a book, than were the other inmates.

The scales in the questionnaire intercorrelated in a consistent manner that reflected self-confidence and a sense of responsibility. That is, respondents who answered in a manner indicating general satisfaction with their lives also tended to have higher self-esteem and a sense of personal competence and were likely to reject illegal activities and government support. Individuals dissatisfied with their lives showed the reverse pattern. None of the differences in these scores, however, were related to participation in the humanities program or any of the other prison educational programs. Nor were there differences between recidivists and nonrecidivists.

Even though attempts to measure the effects of the program were unsuccessful, the manner in which these attempts were made—the scales that were used and the rationale for using them—may be instructive to others who attempt to assess the effects of programs with similar goals.

HUMANITIES-RELATED ACTIVITIES

The humanities program relied heavily on drama, literature, and films as media through which to promote discussion of values and ideas. The students in the humanities program were exposed to many new vehicles of expression, and it was expected that such exposure would cause the students to continue to pursue their awakened interests after release.

The Humanities-Related Activities scale was designed to measure the frequency with which the respondents engaged in seven activities (such as reading, art work, and creative writing) in the year prior to the interview. The rating categories were "not at all," "once," "several times," and "often." These ratings were scored one to four, respectively, and item means were calculated for each group. The separate items were also summed for each respondent to yield a total score which reflected the extent to which the respondent engaged in activities similar to those in the humanities program.

All but one of the item means for 1970 were below 2.0, indicating that the most common ratings were "not at all" or "once." (See Appendix Table F-2. Item means and standard deviations for all years are presented in Appendix Table F-3.) The total means ranged from a low of 10.22 to a high of 12.17 over the three groups for the three follow-ups (Appendix Table F-4). Given the typical background and environment of most former inmates, perhaps higher scores should not have been expected. Unfortunately, there was no evidence that rather extensive exposure to the humanities resulted in any increased interest in such activities following release from prison—the means of the humanities students were not significantly different from the means of the other two groups.

---

* Means and standard deviations for all of the scales are presented in Appendix Table F-1.

Thus, this scale, which constituted the most direct assessment of the effects of the humanities program on the postrelease behavior of its students, failed to reveal any influence on the tendency to engage in humanities-related activities. With this result in mind, it should not be surprising that the other scales, designed to measure attitudes and values far more elusive than gross behavior such as reading a book or attending a play, were equally unsuccessful in detecting differences among the groups.

In reality, of course, the measures of humanities-related activities are also psychological. The results are based on the respondents' subjective ratings of their participation in these activities rather than observations of actual behavior, but such ratings are far easier to define and report than variables concerning one's concept of appropriate values or one's sense of social responsibility. Nevertheless, as elusive as these variables are, they are the kinds of values and attitudes that make up the individual's overall perceptions of the world and his place in it. It was these perceptions that the humanities program tried to influence. Attempts to measure them, no matter how difficult, were both necessary and appropriate, and perhaps other investigators can build upon the efforts reported here.

VALUES AND GOALS

One of the basic premises of the humanities program was that the inmates to whom it was directed would have conceptions of themselves and of society that limited the roles and actions they considered appropriate for themselves. In sociology this position is known as symbolic interaction theory. It focuses on the verbalizations in social behavior which represent the basic norms, values, and rules an individual learns from the significant others with whom he interacts. Fannin and Clinard

(1965) have applied this theory to delinquency in lower class boys and have suggested:

> Self-conceptions may act as a closure factor restricting the possibilities of behavior to a narrowed universe. Direct programs toward changing this aspect of the self-conceptions might prove more helpful than a global effort at pervasive personality change (p. 213).

The major goal of the humanities program was to expose its students to a wider universe, especially in terms of values. The first feature-length film that was shown, *On the Waterfront*, is a good example of the general approach. As mentioned previously, the film contained elements that captured the attention and interest of the students, but neither this film nor most of the other materials to which the students were exposed stimulated the kind of discussion and overt examination of values that were anticipated. Even so, the students were exposed to new ideas, and the teachers' attempts to bring forth discussion may have raised some questions that had not previously been considered. In most of the other activities during the humanities program, the same theme of examining the implicit assumptions of one's life was stressed.

To test whether the program affected these assumptions after release from prison, the subjects were administered several psychological measures. One of these (developed by Goodwin, 1969) consisted of sixty-five items that the respondents rated on a scale from one to ten. The highest rating, ten, was defined as the "best way of life" or "best way to make a living." The lowest rating, one, was defined as the "worst way of life" or "worst way to make a living." Statistical analysis of these items yielded the following six scales (in Appendix Table F-5): Best Way of Life, Worst Way of Life, Desire for Fame and Respect, Approval of Illegal Activities, Acceptance of Government Support, and High Paying but Dirty Work.

The items that make up these scales reflect a pattern of positive goals to be sought and negative conditions to be avoided. The items in the Best Way of Life scale, for example, received an average rating of over eight. Some of the items in this scale were: "having a regular job," "helping other people," "getting along well with your family," and "having important goals in life." The Worst Way of Life scale contained items that were essentially the reverse of these, and they received an average rating of less than three.

The most interesting aspect, however, is not the actual score on any of the scales but the comparisons across groups on each of them. If the humanities program had a consistent effect on the values and attitudes tapped by these scales, the humanities students should have had a mean score significantly different from the means for the other two groups. It was not necessary to conduct a sophisticated statistical analysis of the means to suspect that there were no real differences among the three groups.

The analyses that were conducted confirmed this impression. These analyses compared scores across groups not only for 1970, but also for the 1971 and 1972 follow-ups. For all three years, both for the full samples and the matched respondents who were interviewed each follow-up, there were no significant differences that indicated the humanities students had been influenced by their program.

There were some differences, however, that support the validity of the scales. Most of these were racial differences between the black and white respondents. The blacks scored significantly higher on the following scales: Worst Way of Life, Desire for Fame and Respect, Approval of Illegal Activities, and Acceptance of Government Support. The conditions in society under which many black people must live are too well known to require any elaboration. The tendency for blacks to be more accepting of poor conditions, illegal activities, and government support and to want fame and respect more than whites are natural responses to these conditions. One other set of nonsignificant differences argues for the validity of the scales: for each follow-up, the vocational subjects scored highest on the scale, High Paying but Dirty Work. This suggests that the training which these students received in prison influenced their attitudes concerning the acceptability of jobs with dirty working conditions. The differences that were found indicate that the scales could detect differences among various groups of subjects even though they did not reveal any significant differences among the three educational programs.

Another scale used to tap implicit assumptions of one's life referred to feelings of social responsibility. The authors of this scale (Berkowitz and Lutterman, 1968) define social responsibility as an orientation toward helping others even when there is nothing to be gained from it personally. The overall content of the humanities program touched on many aspects of this orientation. Whenever there was an appropriate opportunity, attempts were made to lead the students to realize that they must make choices which have consequences for others. Nevertheless, there was no indication that the humanities program influenced the attitudes tapped by this scale (see Appendix Table F-6).

There were no consistent racial differences in the responses to the Social Responsibility Scale, but there was other evidence of its validity. For each follow-up period this scale had significant negative correlations with the Approval of Illegal Activities and Acceptance of Government Support scales. This relationship is, of course, what would be expected—individuals with a high sense of responsibility rejected illegal activities and government support.

SELF-CONCEPTS

The evaluations of the experimental phase of the humanities program demonstrated that it had been well received by its students. Virtually all of them had enjoyed the activities in the program and liked the teachers. All but two of the twenty-seven students interviewed at the end of the program said that they thought the humanities teachers really cared about them. The teachers had worked hard to achieve this acceptance. As much as possible, they treated each student with respect and courtesy and arranged learning experiences that maximized the individual's chances for success.

Three scales were included in the questionnaire to determine if these experiences had any effects that continued after the inmates were released. One scale measured feelings of self-esteem, and the other two measured feelings of personal competence and the individual's sense of control over the events in his life. The self-esteem scale (Rosenberg, 1965) assesses how an individual feels about his worth as a person. A high score indicates a feeling of self-respect, i.e., not necessarily considering oneself better than others, but certainly not worse. A low score indicates the reverse: feelings of dissatisfaction with oneself and a sense of personal failure. The personal competency scale (Campbell, *et al*, 1960) and the personal control scale (Gurin *et al*, 1969) appear to touch on similar variables. The items in both scales refer to the individual's sense of control or mastery over himself and his environment or, conversely, the control which events exercise over him. For example, one item from the personal competency scale reads: "There's not much use for me to plan ahead because there is usually something that makes me change my plans." An item from the personal control scale is almost identical: "It is not always wise to plan too far ahead because many things turn out to be a matter of good or bad fortune anyhow."

Despite their similarity in content, the two scales did not correlate highly. The highest correlation, .46, was found in 1971; for the other two years the correlations were .17 in 1970 and .20 in 1972. The personal competency scale actually correlated more highly with the self-esteem scale (r's = .65, .60, and .47 for the three follow-ups) than with the personal control scale.

The response format and restricted range of the personal control scale may partially explain the lack of agreement. The other two scales required the respondent to indicate his reaction to each of the items on a five-point rating scale ranging from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree." The personal control items were in forced-choice format; that is, the items were paired, with one of the pair referring to personal control of the environment and the other to control of the individual by the environment. From each pair, the respondent was instructed to choose the item which best described himself.

Whatever the explanation of the lack of agreement, the point of most interest is whether the humanities program had any effect on the attitudes measured by these scales. The answer, once again, must be "no." (The results for the 1970 follow-up are presented in Appendix Table F-7, and the results for the other years can be found in Appendix Table F-1).

The means for 1970 suggest that the self-esteem of the subjects is slightly higher than their feelings of being able to control their environment. There is no evidence, however, that the education they received in prison was related to any of these scores. Nor were there many consistent racial differences in the scores. The means of the whites were always higher on the personal control scale, but only the 1972 differences were statistically significant. On the other scales the racial differences varied from year to year. In 1970, for example, blacks scored significantly higher on both self-esteem and personal competence, but in 1971 and 1972 the means of the whites were higher, although not significantly so.

RACIAL ATTITUDES

The racial equality scale (Woodmansee, 1966) was one on which sizeable differences were expected between the blacks and whites. As stated previously, racial tensions were very high at Camp Hill during the humanities program. As the inmates began to trust the humanities teachers, they requested discussion of materials related to racial topics. Most of these requests, however, referred to racial conflict rather than to a reasoned discussion of race relations.

The racial climate in the Institution prevented a direct examination of these issues. The prison authorities were concerned that any courses dealing with these matters would only exacerbate conditions. Nevertheless, the interests of the students found outlets in the improvisational drama and film-making courses. The drama course originally was racially mixed but gradually became all black, and a play concerning life in the ghetto evolved. In the film course the students frequently filmed mock fights between blacks and whites. Some of the white students also repeatedly proposed a scenario about the lynching of a Negro by the Ku Klux Klan (a scenario that was never filmed because of the failure to persuade a black to play the role of the victim). Racial attitudes were discussed frequently in connection with these activities, as well as in a class on the modern novel and in many informal contacts between the teachers and students.

Despite this emphasis on racial attitudes, there was no evidence that the humanities students were more supportive of racial equality than the other groups (Appendix Table F-8 shows the means for the total group and the means by race within groups for the 1970 follow-up).

The means for the white subjects were only slightly above the undecided point, 30, and the means of the blacks were not much higher. In the subsequent follow-ups, 1971 and 1972, the means of the whites increased enough so that the difference was no longer significant, even though the means for the blacks remained higher. The basic point, however, is that, once again, participation in the humanities program was not found to be related to racial attitudes following release.

PSYCHOLOGICAL WELL BEING

One other set of measures was included in the follow-up questionnaires: modified versions of scales developed by Bradburn and Caplovitz (1965) were used to study the dimensions of psychological well being or happiness. One scale concerned activities in which the respondent had participated during the preceding week, a second referred to general mood, and the third to matters of concern during that week. These were used to gauge the respondents' overall feelings of satisfaction with their lives. Such feelings were not considered likely to have been influenced by participation in the humanities program. Instead, these scales were included primarily to assess the self-perceived level of well being among former convicts. A secondary purpose was to test if these feelings had any systematic relationship to psychological variables that are usually considered to be more permanent, such as feelings of self-esteem.

The results show the same pattern as all others presented in this chapter; there is no evidence that education received in prison influenced feelings of well being following release (see Appendix Table F-9). Analysis of these scores by race indicated that each year blacks scored higher on the matters of concern scale, and in 1970 this difference was statistically significant. It seems reasonable that blacks, who must confront racial prejudice as well as their status as former convicts, would have more worries than whites. The other two scales, however, revealed no differences related to race.

In general, these scores suggest a fairly low level of satisfaction with one's life. Participation in activities, especially activities involving novelty or social contact, are usually associated with positive feelings. Analysis of the separate items showed that the most frequent activities were rather mundane ones, such as reading a newspaper or watching television. A similar analysis of the items that represented matters of concern revealed the most common ones to be work, money, and getting ahead. On the average, the respondents reported thinking about these matters several times during the week prior to their interview.

In addition to these scales, another separate item was asked of the respondents. This called for an overall rating of "how things are these days." In 1970, 39 percent rated themselves as "not too happy" and only 8 percent as "very happy." In a nationwide sample of responses to the identical question, the proportions were almost reversed: 11 percent referred to themselves as "not too happy" and 35 percent as "very happy" (Gurin *et al*, 1960). Responses to this separate item correlated significantly ($r = .60$) with the general mood scale, yielding further evidence that the respondents were consistent in the way they completed the questionnaire.

For each administration of the questionnaire, the general mood scale was also found to be correlated with the self-esteem and personal competency scales. These correlations ranged from .32 to .52. There was thus a consistent tendency for respondents who scored high on the general mood scale to also score high on the self-esteem and personal competency scales. There were smaller correlations between the mood scale and the personal control and social responsibility scales. The mood scale also had low but consistently negative correlations with the Approval of Illegal Activities and Acceptance of Government Support scales.

The overall pattern of intercorrelations among the mood scale and other scales in the questionnaire suggests that the respondents who were more satisfied with their lives tended to have a higher degree of self-esteem and a sense of control over their lives. A higher level of satisfaction with life also appeared to be related to a sense of responsibility toward others and a rejection of illegal activities and of being supported by the government. Thus, the pattern is quite similar to the customary model of the mature, well-adjusted individual.

In the proposal for the follow-up phase of this project, it was noted that the question of what constitutes adequate adjustment is largely unresolved. The definition of adjustment that was used in developing the follow-up questionnaire centered on the concept of identity. To quote from the proposal:

> It assumes that a healthy person has a relatively clear sense of personal identity. This is an identity that allows one to accept both his weaknesses and strengths without engaging in extreme attempts to deny or exaggerate either. It is, in other words, a realistic perception of one's self and one's situation in life. This acceptance does not mean the individual is resigned to his present situation. He may

feel a need to change the conditions in his life, but he is capable of dealing with this tension in a socially acceptable manner. The individual with a clear sense of identity also feels that he is capable of influencing the events in his life. If he wants to change, he feels he can do so. He also accepts others and feels accepted by them (Lewis, 1969, p. 10).

This description does not deviate much from that found in the intercorrelations of the scales in the questionnaire. These revealed that individuals who were reasonably content with their lives also tended to be positive about their own worth as human beings. They had a sense of control over their lives and recognized their responsibilities toward others and the need to behave in a socially acceptable manner. The model that the proposal set out to test was thus found to be congruent with the pattern that actually emerged. The unfortunate part, from a rehabilitative point of view, is that prison educational experiences were not found to be related to this model. Former inmates either demonstrated or did not demonstrate the model, irrespective of the educational program in which they had participated. This finding was as true for the humanities program as for the others in the Institution. Exposure to the humanities did not appear to help its students understand themselves or to influence their attitudes and values.

Another disappointing result was the failure to find any differences between recidivists and nonrecidivists on scales that measured approval of illegal activities and feelings of social responsibility. The respondents who were convicted of new crimes had scores that indicated they were as socially responsible and as disapproving of illegal activities as the other respondents.

The failure to find a relationship between these scale scores and recidivism raises the question of the validity of the scales. Whenever attempts are made to measure psychological states, it is appropriate to ask whether the scales measure what they are designed to measure. Determining the validity of attitude scales is, needless to say, very difficult. But there is evidence, at least at the psychological level, that the scales were consistent. The relationship between attitudes and behavior is much more complex. Attitudes undoubtedly influence behavior, but always in a situational context which must also be considered. For example, a young man may disapprove of illegal activities, but nevertheless may engage in them under the influence of alcohol or social pressure from a group of friends.

Information on the situational influences upon behavior was not available, but internal analyses of the attitude scales showed that similar scales tended to yield similar scores. Tables F-10 to F-12 in Appendix F show the intercorrelations among the scales for each follow-up. Each scale was also correlated with itself over the three years of the follow-up study. For these correlations, a matched sample, consisting only of those subjects for whom questionnaire data were available for all three years, was used. All but two of these intercorrelations were significant at the .05 level, and thirty-seven of the forty-five were significant at the .01 level. The results of this analysis indicate that although none of these scales seem accurate enough to be used for prediction in individual cases, they are sufficiently stable, when used on a group basis, to assume that they are measuring the same thing over all three years. Table F-13, which presents these correlations, may be found in Appendix F.

Some further evidence on the validity of the scales was obtained from racial differences which were usually significant in the expected direction. Thus, it is not possible to attribute the failure to find attitudinal effects resulting from the humanities program to the inadequacies of the scales. It is always possible to argue that the measures were not precise enough to detect subtle effects. If this is the case, however, what is the importance of such subtle effects? Given the constant interaction between attitudes and situational variables in the molding of behavior, quite subtle attitude changes are unlikely to exert much influence.

SUMMARY

This chapter discusses the postprison effects of the humanities program on the extent to which its students engaged in humanities-related activities and on their attitudes, values, and self-concepts. In both areas there was no evidence that the humanities program had any influence following release from prison. The humanities students were no more likely than the other released prisoners to read a book, attend a play, or engage in other activities related to the humanities. Nor was there any indication that the program had produced any change in values, or made its students more self-confident, socially responsible, or supportive of racial equality.

9

THE HUMANITIES IN PRISON: SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

From September 1968 through May 1969 an experimental educational program based on the humanities was presented to selected inmates of the State Correctional Institution at Camp Hill, Pennsylvania. The program was designed to expose its students to materials and issues of inherent interest which would help them to define a sense of personal identity and to develop a set of values consistent with those prevalent in society. This ambitious goal seemed to be partially achieved while the inmates were in prison, but there was no evidence of any effects following their release. The data gathered in prison revealed that the students in the humanities program became somewhat more aware of themselves and the realities of their environment. This increased awareness, however, seemed to be associated with heightened feelings of alienation and attempts to avoid these realities.

These responses are quite understandable, given the conditions of their lives. The students were, first and foremost, in prison; that is, they were denied most of the supports that are essential to one's concept of who he is. Prison inmates are isolated from normal social contacts, stigmatized as unfit for association with "decent" people, and made completely dependent upon their keepers for virtually every necessity of life. Such an environment would be detrimental to the most self-confident of individuals, and inmates hardly fit this description. The pre-prison experiences of most of the inmates were characterized by poverty, family discord, and academic and vocational failure. It is hardly surprising that increased responsiveness to their situations led the humanities students to shield themselves from this greater awareness.

The follow-up data, gathered in three yearly interviews after the inmates left prison, suggest that the lives they had led before they entered prison were the lives they resumed upon their release. During the follow-up period of thirty-three months, almost one-third of the released inmates were returned to prison. Of those who remained in regular society, almost one-third were unemployed during each interview period. Many of those who were employed expressed dissatisfaction with their jobs, and job changes were quite frequent.

The main problems which the respondents encountered following their release from prison focused on two areas. The first was their inability to find good jobs and, consequently, their lack of money, and the second concerned personal and interpersonal problems. The personal problems described were basically those of readjustment, of attempts to find a place in society and meaning in one's life. The interpersonal problems usually involved former (preprison) friends, especially former girlfriends. The respondents who reported problems of this type were usually trying to avoid the influence of their prior male associates and were seeking to regain the interest of female associates.

Although employment was a central concern of many former convicts, there was no evidence that their prison training influenced any of their postprison work histories. None of the job indices—number and kinds of jobs obtained, number of months employed, hourly wages, or job satisfaction—differed significantly among the three groups studied. With regard to postprison employment, it did not matter whether the respondent had attended vocational classes, regular high school classes, or the humanities classes. Furthermore, there was no evidence that employment was related to recidivism. Those who committed new crimes following their release had much the same employment experiences as nonrecidivists.

During each follow-up interview, in addition to reporting his work history, each respondent completed an extensive questionnaire that contained several psychological scales. These scales were selected because they referred to values and attitudes that the humanities program tried to influence. There were, for example, scales that measured the individual's concept of best and worst ways of life, acceptance of illegal activities, sense of social responsibility, attitudes toward racial equality, and feelings of self-esteem. Neither these nor any of the other scales in the questionnaire indicated any significant difference between the former humanities students and the two comparison groups. Even the scale that measured postprison participation in activities similar to those included in the humanities program failed to yield any significant differences. There was no evidence that the humanities program caused its students to read books, write essays or poems, visit museums, or attend concerts or plays to any greater or lesser extent than the other respondents. In short, none of the follow-up data indicated any effects that could be attributed to the humanities program.

These, then, are the basic results of the humanities program. They present an overall picture of some immediate effects while the inmates were still in prison but no carry-over after they were released. If the program is judged purely on these results, it can be fairly concluded that it failed; there is no evidence that it contributed to the rehabilitation of those inmates who participated in it. Even though the program did not achieve its objectives, there can be some merit in examining possible reasons for the failure. Such an analysis can provide some understanding of the characteristics of a prison and the basic conflicts inherent in its nature—conflicts which our society has never fully confronted or resolved.

PUNISHMENT OR TREATMENT?

Although the humanities program was not designed to study the effects of the prison experience on inmates, the prison setting influenced the development of the program so much that some of the broader studies of corrections were reviewed. This review, together with the data gathered from the follow-up interviews, forms the framework for an examination of the role of prisons and their impact on people. The humanities program was definitely a product of the rehabilitation approach that is dominant in modern correctional theory. The failure to find any effects that could be attributed to the program caused some reconsideration of the whole issue of treatment versus punishment and, indeed, the question of whether rehabilitation is possible within a correctional institution. The thoughts presented here are tentative; there are few firm answers to questions in corrections.

Crime and the system of criminal justice involve all segments of society. The average citizen is not often the direct victim of a crime, but his taxes pay for police protection, court trials, prisons, parole officers, and all of the other institutions and personnel involved in capturing, sentencing, and attempting to rehabilitate offenders. Besides these direct costs, there are other indirect ones, such as public assistance for the families of incarcerated offenders and the higher prices of goods and services that are caused by crimes or the precautions taken to prevent them.

In a larger sense, though, the problem of crime goes beyond these financial considerations and directly concerns the quality of life in a society. People need to believe that their person and their property are reasonably secure against threat. If the incidence of crime begins to threaten this sense of security, people will support repressive measures that are aimed at increasing security. The average citizen is likely to accept invasions of privacy, preventive arrest, or restrictions on freedom of movement if these measures hold the promise of increasing one's personal security.

The most likely target of increased repression, however, is not the average citizen but the convicted criminal. For most of the twentieth century, the treatment philosophy has dominated theory, if not actual practice, in corrections. This approach emphasizes the rehabilitation of the convicted criminal; that is, the length of the sentence, the type of institution, work assignments, educational programs, counseling, etc. should all be geared to prepare the offender to assume a normal life upon his release. The *Manual of Correctional Standards* (American Correctional Association, 1966) is probably the best single statement of this philosophy. Two recent best-selling books, Ramsey Clark's *Crime in America* and Karl Menninger's *The Crime of Punishment*, strongly advocate rehabilitation as the basic goal of corrections.

There are some signs, however, that suggest the emphasis on rehabilitation is due for a period of re-examination of its assumptions and its results. New York Governor Nelson Rockefeller's call for mandatory life imprisonment for all drug pushers and former Attorney General Kleindienst's support of the death penalty are prominent examples of renewed interest in the deterrent effect of severe punishment. Even one of the foremost voices of liberal thought in America, *New Republic* magazine, has published a four-part series on the failure of prison rehabilitation (Martinson, 1972 a, b, c, d).

These are some of the current manifestations of the dilemma that has confronted correctional officials ever since they became responsible not only for holding their charges but also for treating them. When prisons have these dual responsibilities, their practices reflect a complex mix of moral judgments, traditional practices, and scientific thought. To achieve the objectives of security and treatment, society has given one group of people, the prison staff, virtually complete control over another group, the inmates.

The original and still primary task of a prison is to confine those individuals who have been found guilty of violating the basic norms of society. No matter how much they may support treatment programs, security is usually the prime concern of correctional officials. As mentioned in Chapter 3, the relatively new concept of rehabilitation through treatment has been superimposed upon the existing security-custody operation, but the goals of the two types of organizations are frequently antagonistic. Typically, there is no relationship, no integration, no chain of command among the opposing systems.

The quick conclusion that society should do away with prisons since they do not work—that is, released prisoners commit new crimes—overlooks the basic needs of the society that prisons serve. There can be little doubt that prisons act as a physical embodiment of the moral and legal sanctions of the society. Sanctions on deviant behavior are needed in every society, and ostracism is a very common form of punishment. In our complex society, prisons constitute an institutionalized form of ostracism—the convicted offender is exiled from normal society for a period judged suitable for the severity of his crime.

Prisons also provide some psychological relief to the victim of the crime: the criminal pays for his crime through years of imprisonment. What type of society could exist if the victim were largely ignored and the criminal's punishment consisted of various services designed to "rehabilitate" him? Furthermore, if a society were to place full emphasis on rehabilitation, it is very likely that demands for more effective methods of rehabilitation would escalate. The medical and behavioral sciences now have within their repertory many very effective methods to induce behavior change. Only respect for the rights of the individual and a general ignorance of these techniques prevent them from being used on a much broader scale.

Even though the present prison system is by its very nature punishing, correctional officials view their efforts within the context of treatment. Evidence of "improvement" is essential to any hope of early release. If the punishment aspect—time served for crimes committed—were to be eliminated, the demand for methods that really deterred future crimes would be paramount, and those responsible for bringing about such changes would turn to the most effective techniques available. What such demands would do to historic concepts of respect for the rights of the individual cannot be foreseen, but it is likely that the affluent majority who do not go to prison would be willing to condone a great deal if it increased their sense of security.

The current state of knowledge in corrections argues against imprisonment for the young or first offender. In the belief that prisons only tend to reinforce criminal tendencies, the current emphasis is on community-based treatment. These assumptions may well be valid, but they tend to de-emphasize the deterrent effects of punishment and to overemphasize the rehabilitative effects that community services can achieve. Very few of the inmates at Camp Hill were first offenders. Most had accumulated a long record of encounters with the law and had failed to respond to the treatments to which they were exposed in their home communities. Camp Hill was the last recourse for judges who had seen these young men many times before. The recidivism rates of approximately 20 percent following release from Camp Hill suggests that something involved in being sentenced there may have deterred some of the inmates from committing new crimes.

It should be noted, once again, that all the Camp Hill inmates who participated in this study received some type of education in prison. The follow-up comparisons were among different types of educational programs and not between education and no education. It seems very likely that education would be one of the most beneficial treatment programs that could be offered in a prison. Nevertheless, the effects of educational programs on such criteria as recidivism and postrelease employment are unclear.

Glaser's (1964) study of the federal prison system included one of the most thorough examinations of the effects of prison education. He found that inmates who had been enrolled in correctional education programs generally had *higher* rates of recidivism than those who had not been enrolled. Glaser has suggested some possible explanations of this phenomeon:

1. Prison educational programs may be composed of inmates who are already academically retarded and who may be poor risks in terms of postrelease success.

2. Some inmates may simply respond better to other types of rehabilitation.

3. Inmates who are insincere in their desire for self-improvement may enroll in educational programs merely to impress parole boards or other officials.

4. Prison education may raise an inmate's vocational aspirations without increasing his capacity to satisfy those aspirations, thus leading to disappointment and frustration.

Glaser also found that prison education was statistically related to low recidivism only when the education was extensive and occurred during prolonged confinement. Among inmates who were imprisoned for three or more years, the recidivism rates were 30 percent for those enrolled in a correctional education program versus 48 percent for those not enrolled. Both Plummer's (1969) study of a Texas prison and Pownall's (1969) follow-up of the employment problems of released offenders also found that longer periods of training were related to better adjustment following release. In general, however, Pownall's data suggest that vocational training programs have little effect on the employability of released offenders. Less than one-third who received vocational training reported using it in their subsequent jobs; this figure is virtually the same proportion found for the vocational students in the present study.

To further confuse the issue, not all studies of prison education yield negative results. The Draper Correctional Center at Elmore, Alabama, has been the setting for an extensive application of programmed instruction techniques to a prison population. Seventy percent of the inmates enrolled in the program had been incarcerated at least once before, but among trainees who were followed up, the rate of recidivism dropped to 30 percent ("The Road Back," 1969). It should be noted, however, that this self-instructional type of program is far from the norm and cannot easily be compared to most correctional education programs. Morrison (1968) suggests that the Draper project may be especially successful with inmates because of its minimum use of teachers, lack of competition, and lack of embarrassing disclosures of ignorance. Furthermore, programmed instruction provides immediate results and appeals to the inmates' need for immediate gratification.

The effects of a correctional school program on inmates' tendencies toward postrelease recidivism were also studied by Zink (1970). Comparisons between inmates who took part in educational programs and matched control groups three, four, and five years after release revealed that the education group did consistently better on the criteria of arrests, convictions, and sentences. However, less than half of these differences were statistically significant.

These fragmentary and conflicting results reflect some of the best evaluations of the effects of prison education on the postprison adjustment of released offenders. The results are variable because the programs which have been evaluated are so diverse. There is reason to believe, however, that these findings represent the upper range of the possible beneficial effects of prison education. Most of the studies were conducted in cooperation with federal prisons, which are acknowledged leaders in corrections, or exceptional programs in state prisons. The effects of the educational program offered in an average prison are usually not evaluated. In the few cases where average programs are evaluated, the procedures usually lack adequate controls and rarely extend to postprison experiences. On the basis of the data that are available, it appears that, at best, educational programs have limited effects once the inmates leave prison. A much more extensive review of published studies by Kerle (1972) yielded largely the same conclusion.

If this can be concluded about educational programs, what are the chances of finding benefits from other types of prison treatment? Typically, the educational program constitutes the major treatment that is offered, and it should be the one to which the inmates are most responsive. Most inmates have an inadequate education and lack vocational skills, and one would think that they would welcome an opportunity to overcome these deficiencies.

Even with these factors in its favor, however, prison education appears to have a limited effect. Part of the explanation for this conclusion may lie in the attitudes toward education that have been developed in the average inmate. His previous exposures to education have probably been frustrating and often embarrassing. He has acquired few academic skills, but he has learned one lesson well—he is stupid and should avoid educational activities. His years in public schools have taught him that he cannot perform school tasks and that he will be made to feel ignorant and inferior if he tries.

It is difficult to overcome an antipathy such as this in any setting, and it is especially difficult in a prison setting. Prison programs do not usually attract very capable teachers—the most frequent suggestion the former inmates made with regard to improving the educational program at Camp Hill was to replace the teacher—but the quality of the teachers is not the main reason that prison education is not more successful. The humanities teachers were carefully chosen for their ability to relate to the students. The evaluations indicate that they succeeded in doing so, but the humanities program had no observable postprison effects. The inability of the prison to produce positive changes in the inmates lies not in the characteristics of the staff but in the nature of the institution itself.

One obvious point must always be paramount in any consideration of prisons and their roles—prisons confine inmates. This basic fact about prisons produces a social setting in which conflict between inmates and staff is virtually inevitable. Since the inmates typically outnumber the staff, methods of social control based on coercion are adopted. Inmates are reduced to the status of nonperson (Sykes, 1958) and made dependent upon their keepers for the basic necessities of life. These conditions obviously produce many changes in inmates but hardly the type of positive personal growth assumed under the term "rehabilitation." As long as prison is a prison, that is, as long as it confines inmates, it seems very doubtful that honest rehabilitation is possible.

This is not to say that prisons should be abolished. They perform a necessary function in society, and it would be rash to propose that the punishment inherent in being imprisoned does not have some deterrent effect upon crime. What is being proposed is that the prison is not an appropriate setting for rehabilitation. The total environment is so antithetical to the treatment efforts that these attempts are largely overwhelmed. It would seem more rational to separate the functions of punishment and treatment into separate settings where they could be more effectively performed.

Nor is this a recommendation that prisons be made more punishing. They are by their very nature punishing enough. It is a recommendation that convicted criminals no longer be forced to undergo treatment and to demonstrate "improvement" to qualify for return to society. To allow correctional authorities to require evidence of improvement (according to their criteria) gives them enormous additional control over the lives of inmates. When this authority is combined with an indefinite sentence, the control of the officials is almost absolute. Treatment then becomes a matter of the inmates trying to guess the type of behavior that will be labeled "improvement." If this means taking educational courses, they will take courses; if it means attending group therapy sessions, they will attend group therapy. What most inmates want more than anything else is to get out of prison. They will, therefore, engage in any behavior they think will hasten their release.

There are, of course, some exceptions to this general rule. Some inmates become so adjusted to institutional life that the outside world becomes insecure and threatening. A few inmates also refuse to play the prison game. Those who will not submit to the treatment model are the ones who cause the most trouble in prisons, and who spend much of their time in punishment cells. But they are the exceptions; most inmates want out.

If prisons are inherently punishing, there is no need to add to this punishment through inadequate facilities, poor food, or incompetent staff. Prisons should also provide opportunities for personal improvement, including educational programs, but inmates should not be judged by how much they respond to these opportunities. It is in a prison where opportunities are available but treatment is not forced on inmates that the humanities could make a contribution.

THE ROLE OF THE HUMANITIES IN PRISON EDUCATION

The main question to which this study was addressed was whether the humanities could play a role in the rehabilitation of young criminal offenders. The answer to this question must be "no." The humanities cannot play such a role because rehabilitation, as it is presently conceived of within a prison context, is a false goal. Inmates are not rehabilitated in prison. They may be deterred from additional crime, but they are not rehabilitated.

There would be some, perhaps even a majority, of those professionally involved in the humanities who would reject the whole concept of the humanities as a rehabilitative technique. This perspective sees the value of the humanities in their contents alone. What one sees in these contents depends on the individual and the acuteness of his perceptions. Instruction in the humanities consists of sharpening perceptual skills so that fuller and deeper meanings can be grasped. This view of the humanities would also dismiss much of the content of the humanities program that was presented at Camp Hill as not legitimate to the humanities.

There is, however, another viewpoint in the profession that holds the humanities must move beyond its traditionally elitist position and attempt to address the basic problems of individuals and society. The Summer 1969 issue of *Daedalus*, for example, is devoted to a consideration of the future of the humanities. A continuing theme in this issue is how the humanities can be made more meaningful to the present generation of students.

The program at Camp Hill tried to make the issues of the humanities, if not the traditional content, meaningful to young prison inmates. Even though there was no evidence that this exposure had any effect following release from prison, there was ample evidence that it was well received by its students. There were also suggestions of some effects while the inmates were still in prison. On the basis of these findings, the following conclusions are offered:

1. *A course based on the humanities will find a receptive audience among a segment of a prison population.* The disruption, caused by imprisonment, of an individual's life often produces a receptivity to an examination of the meaning of one's life. The humanities can provide a method and a focus for such an examination to which a significant proportion of the prison population will respond. When the humanities program at Camp Hill relied on voluntary attendance, 60 percent of the randomly selected students continued to attend.

2. *A humanities course should include only inmates who volunteer to participate.* A basic theme of this discussion is that treatment should not be forced on inmates. Inmates who volunteer for a humanities course will, in all likelihood, be favorably disposed to the topics and materials to be covered. This should make the course more rewarding for both the teacher and the students.

3. *Racial tension is likely to be reflected in the issues discussed in a humanities course.* Racial tension is present in virtually every racially mixed institution. Given the security considerations in most prisons, it is unlikely that many of the most sensitive issues can be dealt with directly in racially mixed classes. Most inmates will not be able to manage the transition from the control exercised in the total institution to the relative freedom available in the classroom. However, topics related to basic issues can be discussed if prison officials will allow such discussion and will permit the introduction of somewhat sensitive material into the institution. If there is sufficient trust between teacher and students, discussion of related topics will provide opportunities for expression of deeper concerns.

The degree of trust between teacher and student raises the question as to whether a teacher in a prison can build a trusting relationship with students if he retains a staff identification. There is considerable evidence in the penology literature and in the actual experiences of the humanities staff of a continuous, latent conflict between inmates and prison staff. To reach the students in the humanities program, the teachers found themselves identifying more and more with the students. To teach a vocational or purely academic course, it may not be necessary to gain the students' trust, but if the material deals with topics of vital personal interest, some degree of rapport is necessary. Teachers who have more extensive contact with inmates might be able to retain their staff role and still convince students of their interest and concern. The humanities teachers, with only five hours per week, had to gain the students' confidence on a personal basis.

4. *A humanities course is unlikely to have any lasting effect on the attitudes or values of most of its students.* The follow-up results yielded no significant effect on the behavior or attitudes of the humanities students following their release from prison. That is, the behavior and attitudes of the humanities students did not differ significantly from the behavior and attitudes of the inmates who attended the regular academic program or those who received vocational training. It appears that the overall effect of the prison was the dominant factor and the minor variations in treatment had little impact.

To make the comparisons more valid, it would have been useful to include a group of inmates who received no education or training, but because of the emphasis on rehabilitation at Camp Hill, all inmates participate in some program, so such a group was not available. Even if such a group had been available, however, the arguments presented in this chapter suggest that it would not have differed from the others. The prison experience itself appears to be the important variable in postrelease behavior, not the kind of education received in prison.

Even though neither a humanities course nor any other educational program is likely to rehabilitate inmates, it can make a contribution in the prison. What it can contribute is a break in the stifling routine of prison life, an opening of new horizons for some inmates. The humanities can give some students new perspectives and make them more responsive and aware of the realities of their own lives and of the concerns they share with all mankind. David Miller, the coordinating teacher in the humanities project, defined the humanities to the inmates in the following way: "The humanities are about what it means to be a human being." If the humanities can lead some inmates to grasp the implications of this definition, perhaps that is the most that can be asked of any field of human endeavor.

APPENDICES

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix A

ACCEPTANCE OF THE PROGRAM

TABLE A-1

Ratings of the Humanities Program
(Percentage Figures)

	December 1968 (N=44)	April 1969 (N=39)
	%	%
1. Did you like the program?		
I liked it very much.	43	40
I liked it a lot.	18	38
I liked it a little.	34	20
I didn't like it at all.	5	2
2. Was the program interesting?		
It was always interesting.	23	15
It was interesting most of the time.	55	72
It was boring most of the time.	21	13
It was always boring.	2	0
3. Did you learn anything?		
I learned a great deal.	5	18
I learned a lot.	39	44
I learned a little.	48	36
I didn't learn anything.	7	2
4. Do you think you learned anything which might help you get along better in the Institution?		
I learned a great deal.	16	5
I learned a lot.	11	26
I learned a little.	55	41
I didn't learn anything at all.	18	26
5. Do you think you learned anything which will help you get along better after you leave the Institution?		
I learned a great deal.	27	23
I learned a lot.	14	28
I learned a little.	45	31
I didn't learn anything at all.	14	15
6. How was this humanities course, compared to other courses you have taken at the Institution?		
It was much better.	84	92
It was a little better.	11	2
It was about the same.	2	2
It was a little worse.	2	2
It was much worse.	0	0
7. How was the humanities course, compared to other courses you have taken in high school?		
It was much better.	64	67
It was a little better.	16	26
It was about the same.	16	5
It was a little worse.	2	0
It was much worse.	2	2
8. Has taking the course changed your mind about anything?		
I have changed my mind on very many things.	16	10
I have changed my mind on many things.	25	28
I have changed my mind on a few things	32	36
I haven't changed my mind at all.	25	26

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE A-2

Humanities Students' Opinions about Their Various Educational Experiences
(Frequency Analysis of Interview Responses)

Question	Humanities Students' Responses to:					
	The Humanities Program		The Prison Educational Program		The High School Which They Attended	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. What did you think of this program? (General Opinion)						
Generally negative	3	9	17	61	a	
Generally neutral	5	16	7	25		
Generally positive	24	75	4	14		
	32	100	28	100		
$\chi^2 = 24.25$ df = 2 p. <.001						
2. Was there anything you especially liked about this program?						
Something mentioned	27	84	8	26	15	50
"Nothing"	5	16	23	74	15	50
	32	100	31	100	30	100
$\chi^2 = 21.98$ df = 2 p. <.001						

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE A-2
(cont.)

Question	Humanities Students' Responses to:					
	The Humanities Program		The Prison Educational Program		The High School Which They Attended	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
3. Was there anything you especially disliked about this program?						
Something mentioned	10	30	26	81	19	68
"Nothing"	23	70	6	19	9	32
	33	100	32	100	28	100
χ^2 = 18.71 df = 2 p. <.001						
4. Do you think that you learned anything in this program?						
Yes	29	88	11	37	25	86
No	4	12	19	63	4	14
	33	100	30	100	29	100
χ^2 = 24.81 df = 2 p. <.001						
5. Did you like the things you studied in this program?						
Disliked	1	3	13	46	6	18
Neutral, indifferent	3	9	6	21	10	29
Liked	30	88	9	32	18	53
	34	100	28	99	34	100
χ^2 = 26.39 df = 4 p. <.001						

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE A-2
(cont.)

Question	Humanities Students' Responses to:					
	The Humanities Program		The Prison Educational Program		The High School Which They Attended	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
6. Did you do any studying outside of class?						
Never	6	21	16	55	7	26
Less than once per week	5	17	10	34	6	22
Once per week	5	17	1	3	5	19
More than once per week	8	28	1	3	4	15
Every day	5	17	1	3	5	16
	29	100	29	98	27	98
χ^2 = 19.37 df = 8 p. <.05						
7. Did you enjoy this outside studying, or did you only do it because you had to?						
Only did it because required	2	11	5	50	11	58
Enjoyed doing it	16	89	5	50	8	42
	18	100	10	100	19	100
χ^2 = 9.30 df = 2 p. <.05						

TABLE A-2
(cont.)

Question	Humanities Students' Responses to: The Humanities Program N	%	The Prison Educational Program N	%	The High School Which They Attended N	%
8. Did you generally like or dislike the teachers in this program?						
Disliked teachers	0	0	18	64	5	17
Indifferent	1	3	2	7	8	28
Liked teachers	30	97	8	29	16	55
	31	100	28	100	29	100
$\chi^2 = 44.05$ df = 4	p. <.001					
9. Did you feel that any of the teachers really cared about you, or were they just doing a job?						
Most really cared about me	25	93	2	8	14	54
Most were just doing a job	2	7	23	92	12	46
	27	100	25	100	26	100
$\chi^2 = 37.28$ df = 2	p. <.001					
10. What did you think about the way the classes were run?						
Disliked	4	14	16	57		
Neutral, indifferent	10	34	10	36		
Liked	15	52	2	7		
	29	100	28	100		
$\chi^2 = 17.12$ df = 2	p. <.001					

BEST CCPY AVAILABLE

TABLE A-2
(cont.)

Question	Humanities Students' Responses to:					
	The Humanities Program		The Prison Educational Program		The High School Which They Attended	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
11. In class, did you get too much freedom, or not enough, or was it just about right?						
Not enough freedom	2	6	15	58		
Just about right	15	48	7	27		
Too much freedom	14	45	4	15		
	31	99	26	100		
$\chi^2 = 18.10$ df = 2	p. <.001					
12. Did you feel that the other students were really getting anything out of the program?						
None were getting anything	0	0	3	10		
1-20% were getting something	1	4	12	40		
20-40% were getting something	4	15	4	13		
40-60% were getting something	3	11	6	20		
60-80% were getting something	13	48	2	7		
80-100% were getting something	6	22	3	10		
	27	100	30	100		
$\chi^2 = 22.28$ df = 5	p. <.001					

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLF A-2
(cont.)

Question	Humanities Students' Responses to:					
	The Humanities Program		The Prison Fducational Program		The High School Which They Attended	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
13. How well did the students get along with each other in this program?						
None got along well	0	0	1	3		
Few got along well	0	0	2	7		
Neutral; put up with each other	8	24	11	37		
Most got along well	11	33	11	37		
All got along well	9	27	2	7		
Students got along well only within racial groups	5	15	3	10		
	33	99	30	101		
$\chi^2 = 8.30$ df = 5 p. = NS						
14. Can you tell me about one specific thing which happened in this program which you really liked? (critical incident)						
Some critical incident mentioned	22	71	4	13		
No critical incident mentioned	9	29	27	87		
	31	100	31	100		
$\chi^2 = 21.46$ df = 1 p. <.001						

---

[a] This question was deleted from the "high school" section of the interview schedule.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE A-3

Experimental and Control Group Opinions about the Prison Educational Program
(Frequency Analysis of Interview Responses)

Question	Responses to the Prison School			
	Humanities Students		Control Students	
	N	%	N	%
1. What did you think of this program? (general opinion)				
Generally negative	17	61	17	63
Generally neutral	7	25	4	15
Generally positive	4	14	6	22
	28	100	27	100
$\chi^2 = 1.20$ df = 2 p. = NS				
2. Was there anything you especially liked about this program?				
Something mentioned	8	26	23	50
"Nothing"	23	74	23	50
	31	100	46	100
$\chi^2 = 4.51$ df = 1 p. <.05				
3. Was there anything you especially disliked about this program?				
Something mentioned	26	81	35	74
"Nothing"	6	19	12	26
	32	100	47	100
$\chi^2 = 0.50$ df = 1 p. = NS				

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE A-3
(cont.)

Question	Responses to the Prison School			
	Humanities Students		Control Students	
	N	%	N	%
4. Do you think that you learned anything in this program?				
Yes	11	37	36	77
No	19	63	11	23
	30	100	47	100
$\chi^2 = 12.28$ df = 1 p. <.001				
5. Did you like the things you studied in this program?				
Disliked	13	46	11	23
Neutral, indifferent	6	21	11	23
Liked	9	32	25	53
	28	99	47	99
$\chi^2 = 4.65$ df = 2 p. = NS				
6. Did you do any studying outside of class?				
Never	16	55	18	40
Less than once per week	10	34	12	27
Once per week	1	3	7	16
More than once per week	1	3	3	7
Every day	1	3	5	11
	29	98	45	101
$\chi^2 = 5.25$ df = 4 p. = NS				

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE A-3
(cont.)

Question	Responses to the Prison School			
	Humanities Students		Control Students	
	N	%	N	%
7. Did you enjoy this outside studying, or did you only do it because you had to?				
Only did it because required	5	50	7	30
Enjoyed doing it	5	50	16	70
	10	100	23	100
$\chi^2 = 1.15$ df = 1 p. = NS				
8. Did you generally like or dislike the teachers in this program?				
Disliked teachers	18	64	15	32
Indifferent	2	7	8	17
Liked teachers	8	29	24	51
	28	100	47	100
$\chi^2 = 7.54$ df = 2 p. = <.05				
9. Did you feel that any of the teachers really cared about you or were they just doing a job?				
Most really cared about me	2	8	12	28
Most were just doing a job	23	92	31	72
	25	100	43	100
$\chi^2 = 3.83$ df = 1 p. = NS				

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE A-3
(cont.)

Question	Responses to the Prison School			
	Humanities Students		Control Students	
	N	%	N	%
10. What did you think about the way the classes were run?				
Disliked	16	57	21	47
Neutral, indifferent	10	36	17	38
Liked	2	7	7	16
	28	100	45	101
$\chi^2 = 1.38$ df = 2 p. = NS				
11. In class, did you get too much freedom, or not enough, or was it just about right?				
Not enough freedom	15	58	21	53
Just about right	7	27	10	25
Too much freedom	4	15	9	22
	26	100	40	100
$\chi^2 = 0.51$ df = 2 p. = NS				
12. Did you feel that the other students were really getting anything out of the program?				
None were getting anything	3	10	44	10
1-20% were getting something	12	40	11	26
20-40% were getting something	4	13	11	26
40-60% were getting something	6	20	7	17
60-80% were getting something	2	7	7	17
80-100% were getting something	3	10	2	5
	30	100	42	101
$\chi^2 = 4.63$ df = 5 p. = NS				

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE A-3
(cont.)

Question	Responses to the Prison School			
	Humanities Students		Control Students	
	N	%	N	%
13. How well did the students get along with each other in this program?				
None got along well	1	3	1	2
Few got along well	2	7	1	2
Neutral, put up with each other	11	37	18	43
Most got along well	11	37	8	19
All got along well	2	7	2	5
Students got along well only within racial groups	3	10	12	29
	30	101	42	100
$\chi^2 = 6.06$ df = 5 p. = NS				
14. Could you tell me about one specific thing which happened in this program that you really liked? (critical incident)				
Some critical incident mentioned	4	13	18	42
No critical incident mentioned	27	87	25	58
	31	100	43	100
$\chi^2 = 7.23$ df = 1 p. <.01				

Appendix B

TESTS AND SCALES USED TO ASSESS PRE- TO POST-PROGRAM EFFECTS

1. Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (published by The Psychological Corporation, New York)

   This is a well-known psychological inventory which, in its complete form, consists of 566 true-false items which a person can use to describe himself. For this study, only six subscales of the complete MMPI were used: psychopathic deviation (Pd), social alienation (Pd_{4A}), self-alienation (Pd_{4B}), parole violation (Pa V), the correction (K) scale, and the lie (L^1) scale. These subscales include a total of 110 items.*

2. The Rosenzweig P-F [Picture-Frustration] Study (published by the author)

   The Picture-Frustration Study is a projective test of an individual's responses to frustration. Its scoring gives an indication of whether the individual tends to be outwardly punitive, inwardly punitive, or impunitive (ignoring the frustration) in frustrating interpersonal situations. It also provides a measure of conformity to generally accepted social norms.

3. The I-E Scale

   Rotter's Internal-External Scale is a twenty-nine item forced-choice test measuring the degree to which an individual believes people exert control over their own lives and are therefore responsible for their own success or failure (internal control), as contrasted to the belief that people have little or no control over their own lives and are subject to the whims of chance (external control). This variable has often been termed "fate control" (see Rotter, 1966).

4. The Adjective Check List (published by Consulting Psychologists Press, Palo Alto, California)

   This test presents the subject with a list of 300 adjectives from which he picks those which best describe him. It is scored in terms of the degree to which the individual attributes to himself each of twenty-four different needs or personality traits.

---

* Since there is evidence to indicate that responses to selected items isolated from the context of a personality inventory may not be comparable to those obtained within the context, the results of this research should not be considered applicable to the standardized complete form of the inventory.

5. The Jesness Inventory (published by Consulting Psychologists Press, Palo Alto, California)

   Containing 155 items similar in content and response mode to the MMPI, this test was developed for use with potential or actual juvenile delinquents. It provides ten personality-trait subscales and an overall score called the "asocial index."

6. Attitudes toward Law

   This is a scale in which the individual expressed the strength of his agreement or disagreement with each of thirty statements concerning the law, the police, and the courts. It was developed specifically for this study from a list of attitudes-toward-law items appearing in the Minnesota Scale for the Survey of Opinions and in a scale by Katz (refer to Shaw and Wright, 1967, pp. 249–254).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix C

PRETEST ANALYSIS

TABLE C-1

Pre-experimental Differences among Experimental and Control Groups
(Pretest Analysis of Variance Results)

Measure	Humanities		GED Control		Vocational Control		F-Ratio	p.
	Mean Score	N	Mean Score	N	Mean Score	N		
Rosenzweig P-F Study								
Extrapunitive	56.2	46	51.2	15	51.5	47	0.67	NS
Intrapunitive	21.9	46	25.1	15	24.5	44	0.77	NS
Impunitive	22.5	45	23.4	15	22.8	45	0.03	NS
Obstacle dominance	15.4	46	19.1	14	14.5	44	1.80	NS
Ego defense	61.6	46	60.1	15	60.7	47	0.07	NS
Need persistence	23.0	46	22.1	15	26.6	42	1.56	NS
Group conformity rating	57.5	46	57.5	15	55.4	46	0.32	NS
Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory								
Psychopathic deviation (Pd)	25.8	51	24.9	50	24.5	53	0.93	NS
Social alienation (Pd$_{4A}$)	8.3	51	8.3	50	8.0	53	0.15	NS
Self-alienation (Pd$_{4B}$)	8.3	51	8.9	50	7.8	53	1.80	NS
Parole violation (PaV)	13.5	51	14.8	50	13.9	53	1.23	NS
Correction scale (K^1)	11.5	51	9.5	50	11.8	53	3.77	<.02
Lie scale (L)	3.6	49	3.6	46	3.7	49	0.02	NS
Jesness Inventory								
Social maladjustment	70.6	52	73.8	51	67.9	52	2.92	NS
Value orientation	60.0	52	62.6	51	57.7	52	2.77	NS
Immaturity	54.6	52	59.3	51	54.2	52	3.18	<.04
Autism	60.4	52	63.4	51	59.7	52	1.84	NS
Alienation	60.1	52	61.4	51	57.8	52	1.54	NS
Manifest aggression	57.7	52	61.7	51	57.0	52	2.29	NS
Withdrawal	56.1	52	56.4	51	54.0	52	0.87	NS
Social anxiety	48.1	52	48.8	51	47.5	52	0.16	NS
Repression	49.3	52	53.8	51	53.2	52	3.14	<.05
Denial	49.1	52	43.6	51	48.3	52	3.69	<.03
Asocial index	70.9	52	72.6	51	70.0	52	0.68	NS
Rotter's Internal-External Scale	10.0	45	10.5	15	8.6	52	2.35	NS
Attitudes Toward Law	87.8	52	87.6	50	92.0	53	1.26	NS

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE C-1
(cont.)

Measure	Humanities		GED Control		Vocational Control		F-Ratio	p.
	Mean Score	N	Mean Score	N	Mean Score	N		
Adjective Check List								
Achievement	48.4	52	45.6	50	48.0	53	2.05	NS
Dominance	48.8	52	47.4	50	48.8	53	0.64	NS
Endurance	48.8	52	46.8	50	48.7	53	0.95	NS
Order	44.5	52	44.0	50	47.8	53	3.57	<.03
Intraception	46.2	52	43.5	50	46.8	53	1.62	NS
Nurturance	47.9	52	44.2	50	44.8	53	1.62	NS
Affiliation	47.1	52	44.5	50	47.3	53	1.36	NS
Heterosexuality	50.4	52	51.9	50	51.1	53	0.30	NS
Exhibition	50.1	52	52.4	50	51.7	53	1.87	NS
Autonomy	48.8	52	51.7	50	51.2	53	2.15	NS
Aggression	49.2	52	52.3	50	51.5	53	1.48	NS
Change	47.7	52	48.3	50	49.2	53	0.59	NS
Succorance	50.8	52	54.1	50	49.1	53	5.11	<.01
Deference	50.1	52	48.8	50	47.4	53	1.32	NS
Defensiveness	47.5	52	46.8	50	48.2	53	0.23	NS
Favorability toward self	43.7	52	42.0	50	44.9	53	1.00	NS
Unfavorability toward self	50.3	52	55.8	50	52.3	53	3.48	<.03
Self-confidence	43.4	52	42.1	50	46.7	53	5.85	<.01
Self-control	45.9	52	44.3	50	45.4	53	0.35	NS
Lability	49.1	52	50.1	50	49.0	53	0.31	NS
Personal adjustment	45.5	52	43.4	50	45.0	53	0.84	NS
Counseling readiness	50.0	52	50.7	50	49.5	53	0.25	NS
Abasement	48.9	52	49.9	50	47.1	53	2.15	NS

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix D

PRE TO POSTTEST ANALYSIS

TABLE D-1

Mean Pretest and Posttest Scores by Groups

Measure	Humanities			GED			Vocational		
	N	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	N	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	N	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean
Rosenzweig P-F Study									
Extrapunitive	31	56.0	67.8**	8	56.6	65.6	18	51.7	56.6
Intrapunitive	31	21.3	16.9	8	22.6	17.1	18	22.2	20.7
Impunitive	31	22.7	15.4**	8	20.8	17.3	18	21.1	17.2
Obstacle dominance	31	16.0	17.2	8	16.1	15.4	18	12.6	13.5
Ego defense	31	61.8	70.0**	8	63.8	65.1	18	57.9	61.7
Need persistence	31	22.1	14.6**	8	20.2	19.6	18	24.5	19.3
Group conformity rating	31	59.2	49.2**	8	51.0	51.6	18	52.9	45.0*
Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory									
Psychopathic deviation (Pd)	33	25.2	25.3	34	23.9	24.4	21	23.7	24.9
Social alienation (Pd_{4A})	33	7.9	7.7	34	7.6	8.2	21	8.0	8.1
Self-alienation (Pd_{4B})	33	8.0	7.6	34	8.4	7.5	21	7.8	7.5
Parole violation (PaV)	33	13.4	13.4	34	13.9	13.4	21	13.8	13.8
Correction scale (K^1)	33	12.1	12.1	34	10.1	12.0*	21	11.8	12.7
Lie scale (L)	33	3.5	3.6	34	3.4	4.1	21	3.6	3.9
Jesness Inventory									
Social maladjustment	33	69.7	69.8	33	73.3	72.8	21	70.2	69.0
Value orientation	33	59.5	62.2	33	62.1	62.8	21	58.9	57.8
Immaturity	33	56.2	58.6	33	60.4	64.1	21	54.4	59.9
Austism	33	61.0	64.6	33	62.5	66.8	21	60.4	63.5
Alienation	33	59.5	63.7*	33	61.4	65.5	21	59.0	61.4
Manifest aggression	33	57.5	59.0	33	61.3	58.5	21	55.9	55.0
Withdrawal	33	55.6	50.3*	33	57.2	53.5	21	53.6	50.3
Social anxiety	33	47.2	42.3*	33	46.4	44.8	21	48.0	43.4*
Repression	33	50.8	55.2*	33	55.7	57.5	21	54.9	58.9
Denial	33	51.4	44.5*	33	44.7	44.4	21	49.1	50.1
Asocial index	33	68.8	68.3	33	71.9	72.6	21	71.6	68.6
Rotter's Internal-External Scale	31	70.3	9.4	7	11.0	12.0	20	10.3	9.3
Attitudes Toward Law	34	88.4	76.8**	34	89.2	77.5**	20	88.8	84.1
Adjective Check List									
Achievement	33	48.0	48.7	33	46.6	47.9	19	47.3	49.4
Dominance	33	48.8	49.0	33	48.6	50.1	19	46.6	48.8
Endurance	33	49.4	50.0	33	47.8	50.3*	19	49.2	47.5
Order	33	44.4	47.3*	33	44.5	47.4*	19	47.5	47.2
Intraception	33	46.1	44.4	33	43.5	46.1	19	45.8	49.9
Nurturance	33	48.8	46.1*	33	45.2	46.2	19	45.1	43.0
Affiliation	33	47.5	47.3	33	45.8	47.1	19	45.2	46.1
Heterosexuality	33	51.2	52.1	33	52.5	53.4	19	49.6	48.6
Exhibition	33	49.9	52.4	33	52.6	53.1	19	50.6	49.7
Autonomy	33	48.5	49.4	33	52.0	50.5	19	47.9	50.5
Aggression	33	48.8	49.8	33	51.6	50.5	19	49.6	52.3
Change	33	46.7	48.4	33	48.8	48.1	19	47.5	46.7
Succorance	33	51.5	47.9*	33	53.1	46.6**	19	51.3	48.4
Deference	33	50.0	48.4	33	49.3	50.2	19	51.3	48.1
Defensiveness	33	47.1	48.5	33	47.7	47.9	19	47.4	47.2
Favorability toward self	33	43.5	44.6	33	43.5	44.5	19	42.8	43.5
Unfavorability toward self	33	49.7	49.1	33	54.3	49.7*	19	51.1	53.7
Self-confidence	33	43.4	44.4	33	43.0	44.6	19	44.2	45.4
Self-control	33	47.2	46.8	33	45.1	45.6	19	47.6	46.6
Lability	33	49.0	47.0	33	51.2	47.3*	19	46.9	46.0
Personal adjustment	33	45.6	44.0	33	44.7	44.3	19	46.2	42.7
Counseling readiness	33	49.9	47.4	33	49.5	47.6	19	51.1	51.6
Abasement	33	49.1	46.5	33	49.0	46.5	19	49.3	47.5
Stanford Advanced Paragraph Meaning Test	22	7.5	8.9**	20	7.3	8.3			

*Pre to post change is statistically significant, probability less than .05
**Pre to post change is statistically significant, probability less than .01

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix E

RECIDIVISM, EMPLOYMENT, AND MAIN PROBLEMS

TABLE E-1

Mean Pretest Scores of Recidivists and Nonrecidivists
by Year of New Offense

Measure	1970		1971		1972	
	Recid[a]	Nonrecid	Recid[a]	Nonrecid	Recid[a]	Nonrecid
Rosenzweig						
Ext pun	65.76	51.79*	55.41	51.11	63.17	52.30
Int pun	16.61	24.10*	24.84	24.15	17.30	23.57
Im pun	17.79	23.89	19.50	23.89	19.50	23.78
Ob dom	13.68	15.62	12.61	17.01	19.00	15.82
Eg def	67.62	59.92	64.09	58.66	57.43	59.21
Nd pers	20.15	26.19*	23.27	26.08	23.54	26.18
Gcr	53.05	57.04	54.76	56.10	47.57	56.96
Number[b]	13-14	69-72	7	58-63	7	49-53
MMPI						
Pd	23.53	25.45*	24.10	25.48	24.38	24.97
Pd 4A	7.35	8.38	8.20	8.50	8.75	8.10
Pd 4B	7.41	8.49	7.60	8.43	8.38	8.13
Pa v	13.76	14.40	14.10	14.61	14.25	13.94
K	11.24	10.66	11.70	10.08	9.62	11.16
L	3.82	3.51	4.50	3.44	3.50	3.65
Number[b]	17	96-104	8-10	79-82	8	65-68
I-E	10.23	9.16	10.00	9.60	10.00	9.44
Number	13	75	7	65	6	57
Law	87.82	89.61	92.82	89.81	84.25	91.97
Number	17	105	11	83	8	68
Jesness						
S mal	30.12	29.83	28.64	29.98	28.62	29.00
Valor	16.94	18.62	17.54	18.68	16.24	18.18
Imm	15.50	12.63*	13.45	12.98	13.00	12.58
Aut	9.69	9.90	9.82	10.09	8.12	9.91
Alien	11.38	9.88	10.09	10.02	11.38	9.67
Magg	14.31	16.72	16.36	16.44	13.50	16.12
Wd	12.19	12.21	12.46	12.62	12.25	12.30
S anx	10.81	14.18*	13.27	13.10	10.25	13.14
Rep	5.10	3.70*	4.40	3.96	3.50	4.08
Den	12.75	11.73	12.18	11.89	13.50	11.55*
Asoc	26.31	26.08	24.82	26.04	27.12	25.00
Number[b]	16	96-102	10-11	76-80	8	60-64

Note: *Significant at .05 level of confidence.

[a] Recidivism defined from reports of parole agents

[b] Numbers vary because complete data were not available for all subjects

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE E-2

Mean Posttest Scores of Recidivists and Nonrecidivists by Year of New Offense

Measure	1970 Recid[a]	1970 Nonrecid	1971 Recid[a]	1971 Nonrecid	1972 Recid[a]	1972 Nonrecid
Rosenzweig						
Ext pun	74.42	57.45*	62.70	56.87	73.60	61.12
Int pun	11.56	21.65**	17.09	21.60	10.95	19.99*
Im pun	16.56	21.06	23.10	21.80	19.88	21.05
Ob dom	12.69	16.39	12.09	17.44	15.27	15.73
Eg def	77.35	62.98**	69.74	62.79	74.67	65.80
Nd pers	11.84	20.43**	19.66	19.26	14.33	18.88
Gcr	44.03	52.40*	52.60	50.53	48.24	52.03
Number[b]	11-13	69-75	7-8	54-60	6-7	44-49
MMPI						
Pd	23.54	25.18	27.00	25.36	26.71	25.88
Pd 4A	7.46	8.13	8.75	8.14	9.43	8.43
Pd 4B	6.85	7.73	8.25	7.57	8.57	7.92
Pa v	11.69	13.68*	14.12	13.51	12.57	13.74
K	12.92	11.70	11.12	11.70	11.71	11.37
L	4.23	3.84	2.88	4.02	4.86	3.78
Number[b]	13	74-77	8	61-63	7	50-51
I-E	10.38	9.76	12.50	10.05	13.00	9.51*
Number	13	76	8	62	7	51
Law	78.00	80.49	75.62	81.18	65.71	84.22
Number	13	76	8	62	7	51
Jesness						
S mal	32.00	30.31	29.12	31.13	36.43	30.40
Valor	21.50	18.72	21.62	18.88	25.71	18.85
Imm	17.25	14.29	17.88	15.00	16.71	14.40
Aut	12.33	11.24	13.38	11.65	14.00	11.58
Alien	15.42	11.16*	14.25	11.15	15.71	11.02**
Magg	16.92	15.95	17.38	15.93	21.29	16.00
Wd	10.33	11.24	10.88	11.03	13.71	11.33
Sanx	10.92	11.42	12.00	11.50	11.43	11.58
Rep	5.58	4.94	5.50	5.41	5.86	5.26
Den	11.33	11.95	9.88	12.13	8.71	11.98
Asoc	24.25	25.84	19.50	26.70**	27.71	25.81
Number[b]	12	72-74	8	58-60	7	46-48

Note: * Significant at .05 level of confidence
** Significant at .01 level of confidence

[a] Recidivism defined from reports of parole agents

[b] Numbers vary because complete data were not available for all subjects

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE E-3

Classification of First Company Worked for after
Camp Hill, 1970 Follow-up

Type of Company	Humanities (N=32)	GED (N=31)	Vocational (N=34)
	%	%	%
Construction	3	32	21
Manufacturing	53	26	46
Transportation	-	6	-
Wholesale-retail	6	6	12
Finance	-	-	-
Services	34	26	18
Government	3	-	-
Other	-	3	3

TABLE E-4

First Jobs Held after Leaving Camp Hill,
1970 Follow-up

D.O.T. Category[a]	Humanities (N=32)	GED (N=31)	Vocational (N=34)
	%	%	%
Production[b] (D.O.T. 5, 6, 7)	47	26	29
Structural work (D.O.T. 8)	10	42	29
Service (D.O.T. 3)	31	23	21
White collar[c] (D.O.T. 0, 1, 2)	9	3	12
Other (D.O.T. 4, 9)	3	6	9

[a] D.O.T. = Dictionary of Occupational Titles (3rd Edition)

[b] Processing, machine trades, bench work

[c] Professional, technical, managerial, clerical, sales

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE E-5

Equivalent Months and Percent of Available Time Employed,
Total Sample, 1970 and Matched Sample, 1970-72

Variable	Total Sample 1970			Matched Sample								
				1970			1972			All Jobs 1970-72		
	Hum. (N=32)	GED (N=31)	Voc. (N=34)	Hum. (N=19)	GED (N=13)	Voc. (N=19)	Hum. (N=21)	GED (N=12)	Voc. (N=20)	Hum. (N=23)	GED (N=13)	Voc. (N=24)
Equivalent months												
Mean	6.0	6.2	8.9	6.2	7.2	9.0	6.2	6.6	6.8	19.2	19.7	22.0
S.D.	3.3	4.3	5.6	2.8	4.4	4.6	3.2	2.6	2.7	8.2	10.1	9.8
Percent of time employed												
Mean	77.5	75.0	81.3	79.2	84.6	87.9	67.8	76.1	75.6	69.3	64.8	72.1
S.D.	25.2	23.3	25.9	24.9	19.3	20.8	30.0	27.9	27.9	25.4	34.8	27.7

Note: Hum. = Humanities
Voc. = Vocational

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE E-6

Wages Received, First Job and Most Recent Job, Total Sample, 1970 and Matched Sample, 1970-72

Dollars Per Hour	Total Sample			Matched Sample					
	1970			1970			1972		
	Hum. (N=32)	GED (N=31)	Voc. (N=34)	Hum. (N=19)	GED (N=13)	Voc. (N=20)	Hum. (N=21)	GED (N=12)	Voc. (N=20)
First job Starting									
Mean	2.02	2.20	1.99	2.08	2.06	1.94	2.46	2.20	2.48
S.D.	.76	.87	.50	.93	.64	.34	1.20	.49	.65
Leaving									
Mean	2.19	2.29	2.13	2.29	2.12	2.10	2.70	2.66	2.90
S.D.	.90	.84	.54	1.10	.65	.35	1.17	.88	.65
Most recent job Starting									
Mean	2.10	2.30	2.19	2.16	2.65	2.08	2.35	2.21	2.57
S.D.	.55	1.27	.95	.65	1.68	.74	.59	.31	.66
Leaving									
Mean	2.31	2.40	2.37	2.34	2.71	2.27	2.46	2.67	2.96
S.D.	.75	1.27	.96	.92	1.66	.74	.63	.82	.75

Note: Hum. = Humanities
Voc. = Vocational

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE E-7

Socioeconomic Index of First and Most Recent
Jobs, Total Sample, 1970, and
Matched Sample, 1970-72

SES Index	Total Sample			Matched Sample					
	1970			1970			1972		
	Hum. (N=32)	GED (N=31)	Voc. (N=34)	Hum. (N=19)	GED (N=19)	Voc. (N=20)	Hum. (N=21)	GED (N=12)	Voc. (N=20)
First job									
Mean	23.8	16.7	19.7	23.8	16.2	22.4	21.3	27.2	17.3
S.D.	16.1	7.9	11.7	19.6	5.9	11.1	9.7	12.1	7.1
Most recent job									
Mean	23.5	17.9	20.1	25.7	15.1	23.0	22.7	26.4	21.2
S.D	14.7	9.3	15.6	16.7	9.2	17.2	10.5	12.5	12.7

Note: Hum. = Humanities; Voc. = Vocational

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE E-8

Job Satisfaction Rating: First Job after Prison, Most Recent Job, and Total Follow-up Period

Job Ratings	Total Sample 1970			Matched Sample 1970			Matched Sample 1972			All Jobs 1970-72		
	Hum. (N=32)	GED (N=31)	Voc. (N=34)	Hum. (N=19)	GED (N=13)	Voc. (N=20)	Hum. (N=21)	GED (N=12)	Voc. (N=20)	Hum. (N=23)	GED (N=13)	Voc. (N=24)
Work itself												
Mean	3.88	4.26	4.24	4.05	4.07	4.70	4.81	5.33	5.80	4.82	4.73	5.04
S.D.	2.12	1.63	2.06	2.01	1.80	1.95	1.78	1.61	1.36	.78	1.05	1.25
Pay												
Mean	4.00	4.06	3.56	4.05	3.69	3.65	4.33	4.75	5.05	4.17	4.23	4.30
S.D.	2.09	2.24	2.11	2.22	1.97	2.23	2.01	1.96	1.64	1.31	1.05	1.48
Hours												
Mean	5.00	5.10	4.82	5.16	4.85	4.45	4.81	5.33	5.50	4.96	5.15	5.32
S.D.	1.98	2.27	2.14	1.86	2.12	2.39	2.04	1.50	1.82	1.33	1.00	.85
Supervision												
Mean	4.69	5.77	5.12	4.68	5.92	5.45	4.86	5.97	4.95	5.08	5.75	5.21
S.D.	2.10	1.69	1.98	2.03	1.19	1.79	2.03	1.50	1.88	1.27	.87	1.28
Opportunities												
Mean	3.41	3.94	3.24	3.47	4.00	3.65	4.33	4.25	4.80	3.82	4.18	4.08
S.D.	2.24	2.26	2.27	2.32	2.27	2.39	1.85	2.30	2.04	1.32	1.64	1.31
Co-workers												
Mean	5.03	6.26	5.79	4.79	6.31	5.80	5.67	5.50	5.70	5.52	6.04	5.49
S.D.	2.04	1.55	1.57	2.20	1.70	1.58	1.39	1.83	1.69	1.12	.81	1.31
Respect												
Mean	5.06	5.74	5.32	5.42	6.46	5.30	5.10	5.83	5.15	5.25	6.06	5.02
S.D.	2.12	1.71	1.84	1.87	1.05	1.78	1.61	1.70	1.60	1.09	.84	1.07

Note: Hum. = Humanities
Voc. = Vocational

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE E-9

Intercorrelation of Ratings and JDI Measures of
Job Satisfaction, 1970, 1971, 1972

		JDI					Ratings				
		W	P	S	P	P	W	P	S	P	C
1970											
JDI	Work										
	Pay	.33									
	Supervision	.46	.28					N = 89			
	Promotion	.27	.51	.24							
	People[a]	.37	.43	.48	.19						
Ratings	Work	.53	.27	.28	.11	.22					
	Pay	.21	.50	.33	.27	.32	.40				
	Supervision	.36	.34	.60	.18	.34	.33	.48			
	Promotion	.36	.32	.28	.57	.15	.40	.46	.31		
	Co-workers	.15	.28	.35	.21	.49	.24	.40	.54	.32	
1971											
JDI	Work										
	Pay	.25									
	Supervision	.54	.24								
	Promotion	.44	.32	.43				N = 78			
	Co-workers	.40	.10	.59	.24						
Ratings	Work	.58	.12	.42	.36	.33					
	Pay	.20	.64	.10	.26	.06	.34				
	Supervision	.43	.06	.64	.37	.46	.44	.06			
	Promotion	.29	.18	.40	.62	.21	.36	.26	.46		
	Co-workers	.25	.02	.37	.20	.55	.49	.09	.43	.18	
1972											
JDI	Work										
	Pay	.35									
	Supervision	.64	.34					N = 65			
	Promotion	.46	.38	.49							
	Co-workers	.48	.41	.68	.32						
Ratings	Work	.60	.26	.52	.32	.43					
	Pay	.40	.46	.37	.33	.42	.65				
	Supervision	.44	.05	.57	.29	.44	.64	.45			
	Promotion	.48	.39	.57	.52	.42	.58	.56	.48		
	Co-workers	.34	.17	.46	.14	.57	.40	.30	.27	.46	

---

[a] In 1970 the area of the JDI that refers to co-workers was labeled "people."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE E-10

Reason for Leaving First Job Held after Camp Hill, 1970 Follow-up

Reason	Humanities (N=31)	GED (N=31)	Vocational (N=34)
	%	%	%
Still employed at follow-up	16	16	26
Arrest	3	10	-
Company action	19	23	15
Personal reasons not directly related to job	19	3	9
Dislike of job itself	19	6	9
Dislike of conditions of job, including pay	16	16	30
To take another job, go to school, enter service	6	26	12

TABLE E-11

Main Postrelease Problems 1970 Follow-up

Problems	Humanities (N=46)	GED (N=40)	Vocational (N=41)
	%	%	%
Work, finding job, enjoyable work	11	15	24
Money, material possessions	13	8	10
Personality problems	-	10	5
Interpersonal problems	9	18	10
Finding a purpose in life, adjusting to society	9	10	10
Drinking, drugs	6	2	5
Prison record	2	-	-
No problems	28	20	24
No answer, not released at follow-up	22	18	12

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE E-12

Postrelease Usefulness of Training or Education Received at Camp Hill, 1970 Follow-up

Was Training or Education Useful?	Humanities (N=46)	GED (N=42)	Vocational (N=43)
	%	%	%
No, or negative comment	50	55	44
Yes, no further comment	2	5	2
Yes, vocational skills	2	14	30
Yes, earned GED diploma, improved education	--	--	2
Yes, personal improvement, better outlook, better habits	22	14	9
Yes, improved interpersonal skills, get along with people	4	2	--
Yes, specific reference to humanities program	4	NA	NA
Yes, other comments	--	--	7
Not yet released, no answer	15	10	5

Note: NA = Not applicable

TABLE E-13

Suggestions for Improving Educational Programs at Camp Hill, 1970 Follow-up

Suggestions	Humanities (N=46)	GED (N=40)	Vocational (N=41)
	%	%	%
No suggestions, no answer	48	40	34
Improve general education	4	2	23
Improve vocational education	9	8	12
Suggestions on teachers, staff	24	22	17
Suggestions on treatment of students, discipline	9	10	12
Suggestions on facilities, equipment	4	8	-
Irrelevant comments, general criticism	-	8	2
Others	2	2	-

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix F

ATTITUDES AND VALUES

TABLE F-1

Questionnaire Scales:
Means and Standard Deviations by Group for Each Follow-up

Activities, Prior Week

Year		Humanities	GED	Vocational
1970	Mean	18.44	18.05	18.00
	Standard Deviation	3.44	3.98	3.85
	N	45	43	45
1971	Mean	17.91	18.83	18.22
	Standard Deviation	3.53	3.94	3.87
	N	34	29	36
1972	Mean	18.19	17.00	19.64
	Standard Deviation	4.03	3.28	4.24
	N	32	21	31

Mood, Prior Week

Year		Humanities	GED	Vocational
1970	Mean	39.30	37.88	40.85
	Standard Deviation	9.03	8.44	8.73
	N	46	43	46
1971	Mean	38.47	37.52	40.53
	Standard Deviation	9.23	8.46	6.67
	N	34	29	36
1972	Mean	39.56	40.05	41.52
	Standard Deviation	8.26	7.51	8.39
	N	32	21	31

Matters of Concern, Prior Week

Year		Humanities	GED	Vocational
1970	Mean	30.33	31.79	30.09
	Standard Deviation	6.04	7.78	6.79
	N	46	43	45
1971	Mean	30.26	31.17	29.25
	Standard Deviation	5.45	5.79	6.23
	N	34	29	36
1972	Mean	29.38	29.52	30.06
	Standard Deviation	6.28	6.97	7.27
	N	32	21	31

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE F-1 (cont'd)

Best Way of Life

Year		Humanities	GED	Vocational
1970	Mean	114.57	113.09	116.76
	Standard Deviation	22.06	20.33	16.75
	N	46	43	45
1971	Mean	112.94	120.07	116.47
	Standard Deviation	19.58	17.20	18.91
	N	34	29	36
1972	Mean	116.06	116.81	115.55
	Standard Deviation	21.20	18.91	16.72
	N	32	21	31

Worst Way of Life

Year		Humanities	GED	Vocational
1970	Mean	37.09	39.00	37.18
	Standard Deviation	20.74	20.27	17.42
	N	46	43	45
1971	Mean	36.00	34.14	34.33
	Standard Deviation	13.65	17.83	18.38
	N	34	29	36
1972	Mean	36.22	34.00	36.42
	Standard Deviation	12.69	12.97	19.41
	N	32	21	31

Dirty, High Paying Work

Year		Humanities	GED	Vocational
1970	Mean	10.47	10.10	12.50
	Standard Deviation	5.15	4.82	4.26
	N	45	42	44
1971	Mean	10.97	11.31	12.83
	Standard Deviation	4.43	3.96	4.52
	N	34	29	36
1972	Mean	11.47	10.48	12.81
	Standard Deviation	4.18	2.87	4.90
	N	32	21	31

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE F-1 (cont'd)

Fame and Respect

Year		Humanities	GED	Vocational
1970	Mean	30.38	30.38	31.44
	Standard Deviation	10.35	10.89	9.21
	N	46	43	45
1971	Mean	28.34	33.17	30.33
	Standard Deviation	8.54	8.12	9.80
	N	34	29	36
1972	Mean	29.22	31.38	29.29
	Standard Deviation	7.91	8.24	8.70
	N	32	21	31

Approval of Illegal Activities

Year		Humanities	GED	Vocational
1970	Mean	10.51	9.24	10.27
	Standard Deviation	8.39	5.66	8.37
	N	45	42	45
1971	Mean	10.15	10.83	9.44
	Standard Deviation	6.01	8.70	7.10
	N	34	29	36
1972	Mean	9.84	9.95	9.52
	Standard Deviation	6.17	7.23	6.60
	N	32	21	31

Acceptance of Government Support

Year		Humanities	GED	Vocational
1970	Mean	9.51	9.12	9.24
	Standard Deviation	8.05	6.23	6.33
	N	45	42	45
1971	Mean	8.85	10.17	9.44
	Standard Deviation	5.55	6.01	7.39
	N	34	29	36
1972	Mean	9.88	9.52	10.61
	Standard Deviation	6.62	6.49	6.57
	N	32	21	31

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE F-1 (cont'd)

Personal Control

Year		Humanities	GED	Vocational
1970	Mean	3.35	3.07	3.13
	Standard Deviation	1.43	1.37	1.46
	N	46	43	46
1971	Mean	2.76	2.86	3.00
	Standard Deviation	1.47	1.28	1.65
	N	35	29	38
1972	Mean	3.06	3.86	3.42
	Standard Deviation	1.37	1.57	1.22
	N	32	21	31

Self-Esteem

Year		Humanities	GED	Vocational
1970	Mean	33.09	33.14	33.17
	Standard Deviation	4.97	4.69	4.99
	N	46	43	46
1971	Mean	32.15	32.28	33.92
	Standard Devialton	5.86	5.21	4.92
	N	34	29	36
1972	Mean	32.78	31.33	33.84
	Standard Deviation	5.50	5.48	3.97
	N	32	21	31

Personal Competence

Year		Humanities	GED	Vocational
1970	Mean	36.46	25.63	26.22
	Standard Deviation	4.21	4.05	4.85
	N	46	43	46
1971	Mean	25.18	25.38	26.22
	Standard Deviation	4.21	4.05	4.85
	N	46	43	46
1972	Mean	25.56	23.86	25.74
	Standard Deviation	3.55	3.81	4.46
	N	32	21	31

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE F-1 (cont'd)

Racial Equality

Year		Humanities	GED	Vocational
1970	Mean	32.11	32.14	33.93
	Standard Deviation	6.67	7.48	6.72
	N	46	43	46
1971	Mean	31.26	32.69	34.53
	Standard Deviation	6.78	6.05	7.22
		34	29	36
1972	Mean	32.97	33.86	35.58
	Standard Deviation	6.55	4.60	7.21
	N	32	21	31

TABLE F-2

Item Means for Humanities-Related Activities Scale by Group, 1970 Follow-up

Item	Humanities (N=41)	GED (N=36)	Vocational (N=31)
Go to a museum	1.20	1.22	1.29
See a live play	1.18	1.06	1.16
Hear a concert	1.20	1.17	1.18
Read a book	2.66	2.81	2.68
Do art work	1.55	1.42	1.63
Write poetry or an essay	1.48	1.34	1.47
Check a book out of a library	1.59	1.29	1.84

Note: Means calculated with "not at all" = 1, "once" = 2, "several times" = 3, "often" = 4.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE F-3

Means and Standard Deviations of Items in
Humanities-Related Activities Scale by Group for Each Follow-up

Go to a Museum

Year		Humanities	GED	Vocational
1970	Mean Standard Deviation N	1.20 .46 40	1.22 .67 36	1.29 .60 38
1971	Mean Standard Deviation N	1.24 .55 34	1.34 .71 29	1.31 .66 36
1972	Mean Standard Deviation N	1.19 .58 32	1.33 .56 21	1.26 .57 31

See a Live Play

Year		Humanities	GED	Vocational
1970	Mean Standard Deviation N	1.18 .49 40	1.06 .23 36	1.16 .49 38
1971	Mean Standard Deviation N	1.12 .32 34	1.10 .30 29	1.22 .53 36
1972	Mean Standard Deviation N	1.22 .54 32	1.14 .47 21	1.29 .58 31

Hear a Concert

Year		Humanities	GED	Vocational
1970	Mean Standard Deviation N	1.20 .60 40	1.17 .50 36	1.18 .45 38
1971	Mean Standard Deviation N	1.24 .64 34	1.28 .74 29	1.36 .75 36
1972	Mean Standard Deviation N	1.53 .83 32	1.24 .61 21	1.32 .74 31

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE F-3 (cont'd)

Read a Book

Year		Humanities	GED	Vocational
1970	Mean	2.66	2.81	2.68
	Standard Deviation	1.07	1.05	.98
	N	41	36	38
1971	Mean	3.00	2.83	3.19
	Standard Deviation	.97	1.08	.94
	N	34	29	36
1972	Mean	3.12	3.00	2.97
	Stnadard Deviation	.82	.82	1.03
	N	32	21	31

Do Art Work

Year		Humanities	GED	Vocational
1970	Mean	1.55	1.43	1.63
	Standard Deviation	.97	.86	.98
	N	40	36	38
1971	Mean	1.32	1.90	1.69
	Standard Deviation	.79	1.16	1.08
	N	34	29	36
1972	Mean	1.22	1.38	1.84
	Standard Deviation	.65	.90	1.14
	N	32	21	31

Write Poetry or Essay

Year		Humanities	GED	Vocational
1970	Mean	1.48	1.34	1.47
	Standard Deviation	.89	.83	.97
	N	40	35	38
1971	Mean	1.21	1.66	1.58
	Standard Deviation	.63	.99	.92
	N	34	29	36
1972	Mean	1.28	1.43	1.23
	Standard Deviation	.67	.90	.66
	N	32	21	31

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE F-3 (cont'd)

Check a Book Out of Library

Year		Humanities	GED	Vocational
1970	Mean	1.59	1.29	1.84
	Standard Deviation	1.01	.78	1.14
	N	41	35	38
1971	Mean	1.59	1.45	1.81
	Standard Deviation	1.03	.81	1.17
	N	34	29	36
1972	Mean	1.59	1.57	1.81
	Standard Deviation	1.06	.95	1.15
	N	32	21	31

TABLE F-4

Means of Total Scores for
Humanities-Related Activities Scale,
Each Follow-up Group

Year		Humanities	GED	Vocational
1970	Mean	10.76	10.22	11.26
	Standard Deviation	3.77	2.53	3.28
	N	41	36	38
1971	Mean	10.71	11.55	12.17
	Standard Deviation	2.50	3.47	3.22
	N	34	29	36
1972	Mean	11.16	11.10	11.71
	Standard Deviation	2.81	3.02	3.49
	N	32	21	31

Note: Possible range of scores 7 to 28.

TABLE F-5

Means of Life Value Scales by Group,
1970 Follow-up

Value Scales	Possible scores	Humanities (N=46)	GED (N=43)	Vocational (N=45)
Best way of life	14 - 140	114.57	113.09	116.76
Worst way of life	13 - 130	37.09	39.00	37.18
Desire for fame and respect	5 - 50	30.83	30.28	31.44
Approval of illegal activities	4 - 40	10.51	9.24	10.27
Acceptance of government support	3 - 30	9.51	9.12	9.24
High paying but dirty work	3 - 30	10.47	10.10	12.50

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE F-6

Means of Social Responsibility Scale by Group,
Each Follow-up

Year	Humanities	GED	Vocational
Mean	4.65	4.84	4.76
1970 Stand. Dev.	1.85	1.77	1.67
N	46	43	46
Mean	4.59	4.28	4.79
1971 Stand. Dev.	1.77	1.59	2.26
N	34	29	38
Mean	4.66	4.38	4.68
1972 Stand. Dev.	1.47	1.89	1.71
N	32	21	31

Note: Possible range of scores 0 to 8

TABLE F-7

Means of Attitudes toward Self Scales by Groups,
1970 Follow-up

Scales	Possible scores	Humanities (N=46)	GED (N=43)	Vocational (N=46)
Self-esteem	9 - 45	33.09	33.14	33.17
Personal competence	8 - 40	26.46	25.63	26.22
Personal control	0 - 5	3.35	3.07	3.13

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE F-8

Attitudes toward Racial Equality
Total Groups and Groups by Race, 1970 Follow-up

	Humanities		GED		Vocational			
	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	F	P
Total Group	32.11	46	32.14	43	33.93	46	1.06	.35
By race, Whites	31.24	33	20.62	34	33.11	35	11.07	< .01
Blacks	34.31	13	37.89	9	36.55	11		

Note: Possible range of scores 10 - 50.

TABLE F-9

Means of Measures of Psychological Well Being by Group, 1970 Follow-up

Measures	Possible scores	Humanities (N=46)	GED (N=43)	Vocational (N=46)
Activities, prior week	9 - 45	18.44	18.05	18.00
General mood	15 - 60	39.30	37.88	40.85
Matters of concern	13 - 52	30.33	31.79	30.09

Note: High scores on the activities and feeling tone measures indicate feelings of satisfaction with one's life, while a high score on the matters of concern scale indicates dissatisfaction.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE F-10

Intercorrelations of Scales from Follow-up Questionnaire, 1970

	G.A.	H.A.	Md.	Con	B.L.	W.L.	F.R.	I.A.	G.S.	D.W.	P.C.	S.R.	S.E.	P.C.	R.A.
General activities															
Humanities-related activities	20														
Mood	19	-22													
Concerns	28	33	-18												
Best way of life	10	03	23	30											
Worst way of life	01	-06	-07	-22	-26										
Fame and respect	14	06	09	18	42	06									
Illegal activities	-07	-05	-14	-11	-28	23	11								
Government support	-08	02	-11	-10	-22	25	14	54							
Dirty, high-paying work	07	02	16	02	17	-05	-03	05	-02						
Personal control	-03	06	-00	-00	13	01	-10	-12	-14	07					
Social responsibility	19	24	13	25	32	-13	04	-38	-41	03	19				
Self-esteem	11	07	32	10	20	-5	00	-03	-09	-00	20	30			
Personal competence	21	07	37	06	16	-15	03	03	-13	03	17	27	65		
Racial attitudes	12	22	09	19	08	-10	02	00	02	11	08	25	04	10	

Note: Decimal points omitted

TABLE F-11

Intercorrelations of Scales from Follow-up Questionnaire, 1971

	G.A.	H.A.	Md.	Con	B.L.	W.L.	F.R.	I.A.	G.S.	D.W.	P.C.	S.R.	S.E.	P.C.	R.A.
General activities															
Humanities-related activities	15														
Mood	08	02													
Concerns	18	19	-27												
Best way of life	-17	-16	-01	16											
Worst way of life	23	10	02	-05	-51										
Fame and respect	09	-11	-06	01	29	-04									
Illegal activities	16	01	-16	-10	-34	13	31								
Government support	22	06	-06	-07	-32	18	31	48							
Dirty, high-paying work	-00	10	15	-05	-11	01	-02	22	14						
Personal control	04	-02	24	10	13	-05	-04	-08	-15	16					
Social responsibility	-04	03	25	-00	39	-05	-01	-35	-43	-10	25				
Self-esteem	27	01	37	10	11	-15	06	10	04	12	39	29			
Personal competence	19	11	34	03	00	06	-07	-04	-01	17	46	16	60		
Racial attitudes	13	26	12	24	10	02	-01	-14	-04	16	20	37	11	02	

Note: Decimal points omitted

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE F-12

Intercorrelations of Scales from
Follow-up Questionnaire, 1972

General activities															
Humanities-related activities	24														
Mood	10	-15													
Concerns	35	21	-18												
Best way of life	05	-06	19	-10											
Worst way of life	08	07	-37	-05	-32										
Fame and respect	22	06	-06	-01	33	15									
Illegal activities	-03	03	-32	-12	-28	50	30								
Government support	01	-02	-24	01	-26	52	36	66							
Dirty, high-paying work	02	16	-12	11	-03	28	12	32	32						
Personal control	04	-06	19	02	18	-29	-04	-11	-14	01					
Social responsibility	-01	04	27	-03	44	-31	-24	-41	-40	00	30				
Self-esteem	16	03	40	-03	47	-23	04	-18	-16	-06	31	31			
Personal competence	28	13	52	-02	14	-23	-03	26	-16	-07	20	31	47		
Racial attitudes	02	07	14	-06	-05	-08	01	01	-09	-06	10	10	05	08	
	G.A.	H.A.	Md.	Con.	B.L.	W.L.	F.R.	I.A.	G.S.	D.W.	P.C.	S.R.	S.E.	P.C.	R.A.

Note: Decimal points omitted

TABLE F-13

Intercorrelations of Total Scale Scores
with Themselves across Follow-ups, Matched Sample

Scale	1970-71	1971-72	1970-72
General activities	.317*	.376**	.326**
Humanities-related activities	.523**	.678**	.432**
Mood	.418**	.397**	.467**
Matters of concern	.543**	.274*	.392**
Best way of life	.287*	.174	.357**
Worst way of life	.490**	.427**	.422**
Fame and respect	.179	.259*	.386**
Illegal activities	.643**	.563**	.499**
Government support	.333**	.610**	.451**
Dirty, high-paying work	.333**	.411**	.438**
Personal control	.542**	.457**	.475**
Social responsibility	.539**	.375**	.316*
Self-esteem	.623**	.583**	.519**
Personal competence	.478**	.517**	.322*
Racial equality	.629**	.625**	.439**

*Significant at the .05 level of confidence
**Significant at the .01 level of confidence

REFERENCES

American Correctional Association. *Manual of correctional standards.* Washington, D.C.: ACA, 1966.

Barnes, H. E. The contemporary prison: A menace to inmate rehabilitation and the repression of crime. *Key Issues*, 1965, *2*, 11–23.

Berkowitz, L. and Lutterman, K. The traditionally socially responsible personality. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 1968, *XXXII*, 169–185.

Bixenstine, V. E., and Buterbaugh, R. L. Integrative behavior in adolescent boys as a function of delinquency and race. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 1967, *31*, 471–476.

Bowman, P. H. Personality and scholastic underachievement. Freeing capacity to learn. Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1960.

Bradburn, B., and Caplovitz, D. *Reports on happiness.* Chicago: Aldine, 1965.

Breckenridge, S. P., and Abbott, E. *The delinquent child and the home.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1912.

Brigham, J. C., Ricketts, J. L., and Johnson, R. C. Reported maternal and paternal behaviors of solitary and social delinquents. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 1967, *31*, 420–422.

Burgess, R. L., and Akers, R. L. A differential association-reinforcement theory of criminal behavior. *Social Problems*, 1966, *14*, 128–147.

Campbell, A., Converse, P. E., Miller, W. E., and Stokes, D. E. *The American voter.* New York: Wiley, 1960.

Cartwright, D. S., and Howard, K. I. Multivariate analysis of gang delinquency: I. Ecological influences. *Multivariate Behavior Research*, 1966, *1*, 321–371.

Clark, R. *Crime in America.* New York: Simon and Shuster, 1970.

Cleaver, E. *Soul on ice.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1968.

Cleckly, H. *The mask of sanity* (3rd ed.). St. Louis: C. V. Mosby Co., 1955.

Clemmer, D. *The prison community.* New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1940.

Cloward, R. A. Summary in H. L. Witmer and Ruth Kotinsky (Eds.), *New perspectives for research on juvenile delinquency.* U. S. Children's Bureau Publication, 1956, No. 356, pp. 80–91.

Cloward, R. A. Social control in the prison. In L. E. Hazelrigg, *Prison within society: A reader in penology.* Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Co., 1968.

Cloward, R. A., Cressey, D. R., Grosser, G. H., McCleery, R., Ohlin, L. E., Sykes, G. M., and Messinger S. G. *Theoretical studies in social organization of the prison.* New York: Social Science Research Council, March 1960, Pamphlet 15.

Cohen, A. K. *Delinquent boys: The culture of the gang.* Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1955.

Craig, M. M. Six years of a validation experiment on the Glueck Prediction Table of Juvenile Delinquency. Speech delivered 1958. Cited in Robison, S. M. *Juvenile delinquency: Its nature and control.* New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1960.

Cressey, D. R. Contradictory theories in correctional group therapy programs. *Federal Probation*, June 1954, *17*, 20–21.

Cressey, D. R. Limitations on organization of treatment in the modern prison. In R. A. Cloward, D. R. Cressey, G. H. Grosser, R. McCleery, L. E. Ohlin, G. M. Sykes, and S. L. Messinger, *Theoretical studies in social organization of the prison*. New York: Social Science Research Council, March 1960, Pamphlet 15, 78–110.

Cressey, D. R. *The prison: Studies in institutional organization and change*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1961.

Cressey, D. R. Prison organizations. In J. G. March (Ed.), *Handbook of organizations*. Chicago: Rand, McNally & Co., 1965.

Cressey, D. R. Contradictory directives in complex organizations: The case of the prison. In L. E. Hazelrigg, *Prison within society: A reader in penology*. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Co., 1968.

Cressey, D. R. Changing criminals: The application of the theory of differential association. In L. E. Hazelrigg, *Prison within society: A reader in penology*. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Co., 1968.

Cressey, D. R. Achievement of an unstated organizational goal. In L. E. Hazelrigg, *Prison within society: A reader in penology*. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Co., 1968.

Davis, A. J. Sexual assaults in the Philadelphia prison system and sheriff's vans. *Transaction*, December 1968, *6*, 8–16.

Duncan, O. D. A socioeconomic index for all occupations. In A. J. Reiss, Jr., *Occupations and social status*. New York: Praeger, 1969.

Elliot, D. S. Delinquency, school attendance and dropout. *Social Problems*, 1966, *13*, 307–314.

Empey, L. T., and Erickson, M. L. Hidden delinquency and social status. *Social Forces*, 1966, *44*, 546–554.

Erickson, M. L., and Empey, L. T. Class position, peers and delinquency. *Sociology and Social Research*, 1965, *49*, 268–282.

Fannin, L. F. and Clinard, M. B. Differences in the conception of self as a male among lower and middle class delinquents. *Social Problems*, 1965, *13*, 205–214.

Farber, M. L. Suffering and time perspective of the prisoner. In K. Lewin, C. E. Meyers, J. Kalhorn, M. L. Farber, and J. R. P. French, *Authority and frustration: Studies in topological and vector psychology: III*. University of Iowa Studies: Child Welfare, 1944, 20, No. 409.

French, J. R. P. Organized and unorganized groups under fear and frustration. In K. Lewin, C. E. Meyers, J. Kalhorn, M. L. Farber, and J. R. P. French, *Authority and frustration: Studies in topological and vector psychology: III*. University of Iowa Studies: Child Welfare, 1944, 20, No. 409.

Gittell, M. *Participants and participation*. Praeger special studies in United States economic and social development. New York: Praeger, 1967.

Glaser, D. Criminality theories and behavioral images. *American Journal of Sociology*, 1956, *61*, 433–444.

Glaser, D. *The effectiveness of a prison and parole system*. Indianapolis, Indiana: Bobbs-Merrill Co., Inc., 1964.

Glaser, D., and Stratton, J. R. Measuring inmate change in prison. In D. R. Cressey, *The prison: Studies in institutional organization and change*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1961.

Glueck, S., and Glueck, E. *Physique and delinquency*. New York: Harper and Row, 1956.

Glueck, S., and Glueck, E. Working mothers and delinquency. *Mental Hygiene*, 1957, *41*, 327–352.

Glueck, S., and Glueck, E. *Delinquents and nondelinquents in perspective*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1968.

Goffman, E. *Asylums: Essays on the social situation of mental patients and other inmates*. Garden City, New York: Anchor Books, Doubleday & Co., 1961.

Goodwin, L. Work orientations of the underemployed poor: Report of a pilot study. *Journal of Human Resources*, 1969, *4*, 509–519.

Gordon, R. A. Issues in the ecological study of delinquency. *American Sociological Review*, 1967, *32*, 927–944.

Gottfredson, D. M. Current information bases for evaluating correctional programs. In Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, *Research in Correctional Rehabilitation*. Washington, D.C.: Joint Commission, 1967.

Graubard, S. R. (Ed.) The future of the humanities. *Daedalus*, Summer 1969, *98* (3).

Greenwood, E. New directions in delinquency research: A commentary on a study of Bernard Lander. *Social Science Review*, 1956, *30*, 147–157.

Gurin, G., Veroff, J., and Feld, S. *Americans view their mental health*. New York: Basic Books, 1960.

Gurin, P., Gurin, G., Lao, R. C., and Beattle, M. Multidimensional I-E Scale (with special emphasis on race ideology). In J. P. Robinson and P. R. Shaver, *Measures of social psychological attitudes*. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Survey Research Center, 1969.

Healy, W., and Bronner, A. *New light on delinquency and its treatment*. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1936.

Henderson, W. *A black sociologist looks at white sociology*. Paper presented at The Pennsylvania State University, 1968.

Heron, W. The pathology of boredom. *Scientific American*, 1958, *198*, 81–90.

Hirschi, T., and Selvin, H. C. False criteria of causality in delinquency research. *Social Problems*, 1966, *13*, 254–268.

Horrocks, J. E., and Gottfried, N. W. Psychological needs and verbally expressed aggression of adolescent delinquent boys. *Journal of Psychology*, 1966, *62*, 179–194.

Jenkins, R. L. *Motivation and frustration in delinquency*. Speech presented at American Orthopsychiatric Association, 1956.

Jesness, C. F. *Manual for the Jesness Inventory*. Palo Alto, California: Consulting Psychologists Press, 1966.

Kerle, K. E. *Inmate education: U. S. and Europe*. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, Washington, D.C., December 1972.

Kretschmer, E. *Physique and character*. Translated by W. H. Sprott. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, 1925.

Kubzansky, P. E. The effect of reduced environmental stimulation on human behavior: A review. In A. D. Biderman and H. Zimmer (Eds.), *The manipulation of human behavior*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1961.

Lander, B. *Toward an understanding of juvenile delinquency*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1954.

Lerman, R. Gangs, networks, and subcultural delinquency. *American Journal of Sociology*, 1967, *73*, 63–72.

Lewin, K. *Resolving social conflicts*. New York: Harper & Bros., 1948.

Lewin, K., Lippitt, R., and White, R. Patterns of aggressive behavior in experimentally created "social climates." *Journal of Social Psychology*, 1939, *10*, 271–299.

Lewis, M. V. The role of the humanities in the rehabilitation of young criminal offenders. Research proposal submitted to the National Endowment for the Humanities, 1969.

Lilly, J. C. Mental effects of reduction of physical stimuli on intact healthy persons. *Psychiatric Research Report*, 1958, *5*, 1–9.

Lykken, D. T. A study of anxiety in the sociopathic personality. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 1957, *55*, 6–10.

Maccoby, E. Children and working mothers. *The Child*, 1958, *5*, 83–89.

Maccoby, E., Johnson, J. P., and Church, R. M. Community integration and the social control of juvenile delinquency. *Journal of Social Issues*, 1958, *14*, 38–51.

Malcolm X. *The autobiography of Malcolm X*. New York: Grove Press, 1964.

Martin, J. M., and Fitzpatrick, J. P. *Delinquent behavior: A redefinition of the problem*. New York: Random House, 1964.

Martinson, R. The paradox of prison reform—I. The "dangerous myth." *The New Republic*, April 1, 1972, *166* (14), 23–25. (a)

Martinson, R. The paradox of prison reform—II. Can corrections correct? *The New Republic*, April 8, 1972, *166* (15), 13–15. (b)

Martinson, R The paradox of prison reform—III. The meaning of Attica. *The New Republic*, April 15, 1972, *166*, (16), 17–19. (c)

Martinson, R. The paradox of prison reform—IV. Planning for public safety. *The New Republic*, April 29, 1972, *166* (18), 21–23. (d)

Maslow, A. A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review*, 1943, *50*, 370–396.

Maslow, A. *Toward a psychology of being*. Princeton, New Jersey: D. Van Nostrand Co., 1962.

McCleery, R. Communication patterns as bases of systems of authority and power. In R. A. Cloward, D. R. Cressey, G. H. Grosser, R. McCleery, L. E. Ohlin, G. M. Sykes, and S. L. Messinger, *Theoretical studies in social organization of the prison*. New York: Social Science Research Council, March 1960, Pamphlet 15.

McCleery, R. Correctional administration and political change. In L. E. Hazelrigg, *Prison within society: A reader in penology*. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Co., 1968.

McCorkle, J., and Korn, R. Resocialization within walls. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences*, May 1954, *293*.

Menninger, K. *The crime of punishment*. New York: The Viking Press, 1966.

Merton, R. K. *Social structure and anomie*. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1949.

Miller, W. B. Lower class culture as a generating milieu of gang delinquency. *Journal of Social Issues*, 1958, *14*, 5–19.

Morrison, J. W. The effectiveness and benefit of correctional education: An evaluation of the Draper correctional program. *Canadian Journal of Corrections*, 1968, *10*, 428–431.

Nordstrom, C., Friedenberg, E., and Gold, H. *Society's children: A study of resentment in the secondary school*. New York: Random House, 1967.

Panton, J. H. Use of the MMPI as an index to successful parole. *Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science*, 1962, *53*, 484–488.

Pine, G. J. Social class, social mobility, and delinquent behavior. *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 1965, *43*, 770–774.

Plummer, J. M., Jr. A comparison of successful and unsuccessful vocational rehabilitation clients from a reformatory population. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Texas Tech University, 1969.

Polsky, H. W. *Cottage six—The social system of delinquent boys in residential treatment*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1962.

Pownall, G. A. *Employment problems of released prisoners*. Washington, D.C.: Manpower Administration, U. S. Department of Labor, 1969.

Quay, H. C., and Blumen, L. Factor dimensions of delinquent behavior. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 1963, *61*, 273–277.

Reckless, W. C., Dinitz, S., and Murray, E. The self-concept as an insulator against delinquency. *American Sociological Review*, 1956, *21*, 744–746.

The road back. *Manpower*, June 1969, *1*, 15–18.

Robison, S. M. *Juvenile delinquency: Its nature and control*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1960.

Rogers, C. R. *Client-centered therapy*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1951.

Rogers, C. R. A theory of therapy, personality, and interpersonal relationships as developed in the client-centered framework. In S. Koch (Ed.), *Psychology: A study of a science. Volume 3. Formulations of the person and the social context*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959, pp. 184–256.

Rosenberg, M. *Society and the adolescent self-image*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1965.

Roser, M. The role of the schools in heading off delinquency. *Yearbook*, National Probation and Parole Association, 1951, 168–183.

Rotter, J. B. Internal versus external control of reinforcement. *Psychological Monographs*, 1966, *80*, No. 609.

Sands, B. *My shadow ran fast*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1964.

Scarpitti, F. R. Delinquent and nondelinquent perceptions of self, values, and opportunity. *Mental Hygiene*, 1965, *49*, 399–404.

Schlapp, M. G., and Smith, E. H. *The new criminology*. New York: Liveright, 1928.

Schlicter, K. J. Discrimination learning in juvenile delinquents. Unpublished master's thesis, The Pennsylvania State University, 1969.

Schrag, C. Some foundation for a theory of correction. In D. R. Cressey, *The prison: Studies in institutional organization and change*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1961.

Shaw, C. R. *Delinquency areas*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1929.

Shaw, C. R., and McKay, H. D. Social forces in juvenile delinquency. *Report on the Causes of Crime*, 2, 1931.

Shaw, M., and Wright, J. *Scales for the measurement of attitudes*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.

Sheldon, W. H., Hartl, E. M., and McDermott, E. *Varieties of delinquent youth: An introduction to constitutional psychology*. New York: Harper & Row, 1949.

Shiloh, A. Sanctuary or prison—Responses to life in a mental hospital. *Transaction*, December 1968, *6*, 28–36.

Silver, A. W. TAT and MMPI Psychopathic Deviant Scale differences between delinquent and nondelinquent adolescents. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 1963, *27*, 370.

Smith, P. C., Kendall, L. M., and Hulin, C. L. *The measurement of satisfaction in work and retirement*. New York: Rand, McNally & Co., 1969.

Street, D. *Inmate social organization in custodial and treatment settings.* Working Paper No. 9. Chicago: Center for Social Organization Studies, Department of Sociology, University of Chicago, April 1963.

Sutherland, E. H., and Cressey, D. R. *Principles of criminology.* Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1966.

Sykes, G. M. *The society of captives: A study of maximum security prisons.* Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1958.

Sykes, G. M. *Crime and society.* New York: Random House, 1966.

Sykes, G. M., and Matza, D. Techniques of neutralization. *American Sociological Review,* 1957, *22*, 666–670.

Telfer, M. A. Incidence of gross chromosomal errors among tall criminal American males. *Science,* 1968, *159*, 1249–1250.

Thrasher, F. M. *The gang.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1927.

Turk, A. T. Prospects for theories of criminal behavior. *Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science,* 1964, *55*, 454–461.

Vinter, R. D., Janowitz, M. *et al.* The comparative study of juvenile correctional institutions: A research report. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan School of Social Work, December 1961.

Voss, H. L. Differential association and reported delinquent behavior. *Social Problems,* 1964, *12*, 78–85.

Wilkins, L. T. Juvenile delinquency: A critical review of research and theory. *Education Research,* 1963, *5*, 104–119.

Wilkins, L. T., and McNaughton-Smith, P. New prediction and classification methods in criminology. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency,* 1964, *1*, 19–32.

Woodmansee, J. J. Scoring instructions for the Reactions Questionnaire, Form C-2. University of Colorado, 1966. (Mimeograph).

Zald, M. N. Power balance and staff conflict in correctional institutions. In L. E. Hazelrigg, *Prison within society: A reader in penology.* Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Co., 1968, pp. 397–425.

Zink, T. M. A study of the effect of prison education on societal adjustment. *Journal of Correctional Education,* Spring 1970, *22*, 18–20.

INSTITUTE FOR RESEARCH ON HUMAN RESOURCES
407 Kern Graduate Building
University Park, Pennsylvania 16802

PUBLICATIONS

Corrections

Prison Education and Rehabilitation: Illusion or Reality? Morgan V. Lewis, 1973, 180 pp.	$5.00

Education

The Role of the Secondary Schools in the Preparation of Youth for Employment, Jacob J. Kaufman, Carl J. Schaefer, Morgan V. Lewis, *et al.*, 1967, 339 pp.	$3.00
The Potential of Vocational Education: Observations and Conclusions, Jacob J. Kaufman and Morgan V. Lewis, 1968, 134 pp.	$2.00
The School Environment and Programs for Dropouts, Jacob J. Kaufman and Morgan V. Lewis, assisted by David C. Gumpper, 1968, 184 pp.	$2.00
The High School Diploma: Credential for Employment? Morgan V. Lewis and Jacob J. Kaufman, 1972, 185 pp.	$5.00

Manpower

A Community Organizes for Action: A Case Study of the Mon-Yough Region in Pennsylvania, Robert W. Avery and Herbert A. Chesler, 1967, 105 pp.	$2.00
The Development and Utilization of Human Resources: A Guide for Research, Jacob J. Kaufman, Grant N. Farr, and John C. Shearer, 1967, 77 pp.	$2.00
Manpower Information for Urban Poverty Areas, Louis Levine and John Herbert Norton, 1969, 268 pp.	$3.00
The Potential for Human Resources and Economic Growth in a Declining Local Community, Louis Levine, George Walter, Kenneth Masters, Alice Warne, and Terry Foran, 1970, 357 pp.	$5.00
Recruiting, Placing, and Retaining the Hard-to-Employ, Morgan V. Lewis, Elchanan Cohn, *et al.*, 1971, 290 pp.	$4.00
The Management of Manpower Programs in Urban Areas, Louis Levine and Kenneth W. Masters, Bernard R. Siskin, 1971, 183 pp.	$3.00

Evaluation

A Cost-Effectiveness Study of Vocational Education, Jacob J. Kaufman, Teh-wei Hu, Maw Lin Lee, and Ernst W. Stromsdorfer, 1969, 330 pp.	$5.00
A Cost-Effectiveness Study of Child Health and Welfare Programs, Teh-wei Hu, Elchanan Cohn, Thomas G. Fox, and Jacob J. Kaufman, 1971, 421 pp.	$5.00
The Costs of Vocational and Nonvocational Programs, Elchanan Cohn, Teh-wei Hu, and Jacob J. Kaufman, 1972, 145 pp.	$5.00

Science Policy

State Organization of Research and Development: A Case Study, Irwin Feller, Jon P. Nelson, with Robert Friedman and James Mead, 1970, 254 pp.	$2.00
Proceedings of the Pennsylvania Science Policy Workshop, 1970, 117 pp.	$1.00
State Science Activities: Papers and Discussion, Irwin Feller, Jon P. Nelson, and Wesley H. Long, 1970, 75 pp.	$2.00
Workshop on the Application of Science and Technology to the Municipal Governments of Pennsylvania: Papers and Summary of Proceedings, 1971, 122 pp.	$3.00
Intergovernmental Relations in the Administration and Performance of Research on Air Pollution, Irwin Feller, Alfred Engel, and Robert Friedman, 1972, 250 pp.	$5.00
Economic Aspects of the Relationship between Research and Development Activities and State Economic Growth, Irwin Feller, Wesley Long, and Jon Nelson, 1972, 265 pp.	$5.00